

Mr. VARDAMAN. But the Senator does not, perhaps, understand—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield? The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. I only rose to answer a question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If I may be permitted to do so, I wanted to get the Senator's opinion about that. The idea which I want to bring out is the fact that there is a law now upon the statute book under which the Postmaster General acted in making this investigation. That law requires him to make this investigation before any contract could be renewed.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes. That commission has expired, however.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator thinks that that law is exhausted, does he?

Mr. BRYAN. The commission has made its report.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I know it is the opinion of men who have given thought to this question in the House that the provision in that bill would not compel the Postmaster General to act if the Senate agreed with the House and adopted the House provision. Now, in order to do that you have gone ahead and repealed a general law, an existing law, by amendment onto an appropriation bill.

Mr. BRYAN. No.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. The law directed the commission to report a year ago last December and the time expired. The report was not sent in in conformity with law. It dragged along and dragged along and nothing was done. Congress made another appropriation and the Postmaster General saw fit not to expend it.

Mr. BRYAN. What the Senator from Mississippi has in mind is this: The House made an appropriation placing it within the power of the Postmaster General not to expend the money. The amendment provides that he shall expend the money by continuing this service for a year.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wish to understand the parliamentary situation. I understand that the Senator from Washington has appealed from the decision of the Chair. If the Senate adjourns now, would that open up this whole question in the Senate to-morrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did understand that an appeal was taken, so that it will open up the whole question to-morrow.

Mr. POINDEXTER. An appeal was taken, and one purpose I had in rising was in order to call attention to it so that there would be no uncertainty about it.

In this connection, as it will go over until to-morrow, I should like to say, in order that it may be in the RECORD in the morning when the matter comes up as the basis of the point of order which I have made and of the appeal, that the appeal is only taken from that portion of the Chair's ruling which overruled the point of order as to that portion of the amendment on page 15, from line 12 down to and including the word "authorized" in line 20. The Postmaster General or the First Assistant Postmaster General filed a statement here from which the Senator from Mississippi has read. I do not care to encumber the RECORD by a mere repetition of it, but he says if this amendment is adopted it will compel the expenditure by the Government of \$613,000, which would do the Government no good whatever. If the amendment is not adopted, not a dollar of that amount will have to be expended. In other words, here is a proposed law compelling contracts by the Government which will cost the Government nearly three-quarters of a million dollars and establishing a service which, without the adoption of the amendment, would not exist.

In view of this it is clearly general legislation. The vital and substantial thing in this whole controversy is about what is involved and provided for in this amendment, and in the first part of the amendment, the point of order against which was overruled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to say that the Chair agrees with the Senator that it is general legislation, but the House entered on that part of the subject, and consequently the Senate can enlarge it and offer such amendments as may be desired. Upon that part of the amendment the Chair ruled in conformity with what the Chair understands has heretofore been held on that subject by the Vice President.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I appreciate the theory upon which the Chair has ruled, and if the facts in the case were as the Chair construes them to be in this provision, I would agree with the Chair, for I think that is a correct principle. But I differ with

the construction which the Chair places upon the House provision. There is nothing whatever in the House provision establishing this pneumatic-tube service for the year ending June 30, 1918. There is not a word authorizing or attempting to authorize the establishment of any such service. There is no provision in regard to it. It is entirely new matter inserted in the Senate committee amendment. The appropriation of money for pneumatic-tube service by the House, as the House provision stood, could be expended and used by the Postmaster General for that purpose or not, as he saw fit. It was a mere appropriation of money under the existing law. The portion of the amendment to which I am addressing myself takes out of the discretion of the Postmaster General the matter of establishing this pneumatic service and establishes it by law. Consequently it is new matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. LEWIS. Had we not better adjourn?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The point of no quorum has been made, but I withdraw it.

Mr. LODGE. That does not lie against a motion to adjourn.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was made first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 14, 1917, at 10 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 13, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, look down from Thy throne of justice, mercy, and good will upon Thy children everywhere, and inspire them with higher ideals, purer motives, and earnest endeavors; that ignorance may give way to wisdom, error to truth, and all wrongs be righted; that peace and righteousness may prevail, that the dear old earth may blossom as the rose in every nook and corner, and Thy will be done in every heart through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### AMENDMENT OF GENERAL DAM ACT.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call up the conference report printed in the RECORD this morning on the bill S. 3331.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. ADAMSON. Wait a minute.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How long will it take?

Mr. ADAMSON. Only a moment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I withdraw my request for a moment.

Mr. MANN. Is that a conference report on the dam bill?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. There might be quite a discussion of the bill in the House.

Mr. ADAMSON. I should think not. If any discussion comes it would be on any action the Senate might take afterwards.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] requests that I let it go over temporarily until the naval bill is disposed of. If I can be recognized then, I will agree to that.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 18551. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River; and

H. R. 18725. An act granting the consent of Congress to Kratka Township, Pennington County, Minn., to construct a bridge across Red Lake River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 455. An act to define the rights and privileges of the trustees of municipally owned interstate railways and constraining the act to regulate commerce with reference thereto;

H. R. 9288. An act providing for the refund of certain duties illegally levied and collected on acetate of lime;

H. R. 19937. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 8348. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 20574. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Decatur County, Ga., to reconstruct a bridge across the Flint River at Bainbridge, Ga.;

H. R. 14471. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary";

H. R. 18550. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River; and

H. R. 10697. An act for the relief of S. Spencer Carr.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7438. An act to make immediately available for the use of the State of Georgia in paying expenses incurred by said State in connection with the joint encampment held at Augusta, Ga., July 22 to 31, 1914, certain sums appropriated for arming and equipping the militia of said State;

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to grant citizenship to Joseph Beech;

S. 8075. An act for the relief of Marguerite Mathilde Slidell d'Erlanger;

S. 457. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the northern and southern judicial districts in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes;

S. 7601. An act for the relief of Caleb T. Holland;

S. 1379. An act for the relief of James Gloster;

S. 2362. An act for the relief of John Doyle, alias John Geary;

S. 3269. An act for the relief of Francis M. Atherton;

S. 7316. An act for the relief of William Thomas Winstanley;

S. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution authorizing the removal of the statue of Admiral Dupont, in Dupont Circle, in the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection of a memorial to Admiral Dupont in place thereof;

S. 6286. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims;

S. 41. An act to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska;

S. 7767. An act relating to the temporary filling of vacancies occurring in the offices of register and receiver of district land offices;

S. 7906. An act to authorize the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint George L. Morrison captain of Cavalry, to take rank as such next after Capt. James A. Mars;

S. 8113. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7796. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey to the Great Northern Railway Co. certain lands in the State of Montana for division terminal yards and other railway purposes, and for other purposes;

S. 8120. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 3771. An act for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff;

S. 8044. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act; and

S. 6690. An act for the relief of Americus A. Gordon.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate resolution 357.

*Resolved*, That at 10 minutes before 1 o'clock on Wednesday, February 14, 1917, the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to take part in the count of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

The Vice President had announced the appointment of Mr. CLAPP to serve as a teller on the part of the Senate at said count of the electoral vote in place of Mr. DILLINGHAM, who is unable to act on account of illness.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 457. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the northern and southern judicial districts in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 19359, the Agricultural appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Agricultural appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection? The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I wish to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to amendment No. 92, which seeks to amend section 8 of the nursery quarantine act in some very important particulars. The amendment as incorporated in the bill would grant authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to exclude all stone or quarry products, or any other article of any character whatsoever, from interstate shipment in case he deemed that the admission of them would tend to disseminate insect infestation. I think that is a very important amendment, and to confer such an authority on the Secretary of Agriculture without it having ever been given any consideration in the House would not be in consonance with good legislation, and I think before we allow this bill to go to conference we should have some understanding as to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I realize this is a very important amendment, and I agree with him and the House now that if the gentleman from Wisconsin or any other Member feels we ought to have a separate vote on it before final agreement, I shall be glad to give the House the opportunity to so vote.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the House should be given the privilege of considering such a matter before agreeing to it in conference. The subject matter has never been considered in the House. It is something that should not be considered alone by the conferees.

Mr. LEVER. I agree with the gentleman, and I will say that a separate vote will be asked on the proposition unless it is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and announces the following conferees: Mr. LEVER, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HAUGEN.

#### AMENDMENT TO GENERAL DAM ACT (S. 3331).

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdraws his objection, and I would like to call the conference report up now.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The conference report was read, as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1453).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, having met, after full and free conference hereby report to their respective Houses that it is impossible for the managers on the part of the respective Houses to agree upon any report that would secure legislation in the premises.



They find themselves at such variance on the provisions of the Senate act and the House amendment thereto that they have agreed on a general disagreement, and hereby report to the Senate and House that they can not reach any agreement upon the Senate act and the House amendment thereto under consideration.

W. C. ADAMSON,

T. W. SIMS,

JOHN J. ESCH,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

JNO. K. SHIELDS,

J. H. BANKHEAD,

KNUTE NELSON,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ESCH. Is it in order to adopt the conference report where there is a full disagreement? I base my inquiry on a precedent, No. 6562, volume 5, of Hinds' Precedents.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine the precedent.

Mr. ESCH. The precedent may be misinterpreted by myself, but it arose this way: Mr. Otjen, of Wisconsin, a colleague of mine, raised it in connection with certain claims under the Bowman Act, stating that after a full and free conference they had been unable to agree. The report having been read, Mr. Otjen moved that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Mr. Richardson, of Tennessee, made the point of order that the report of the committee should be adopted first. Mr. Reed was Speaker at the time and stated that there was no legislation in the conference report, and therefore there was nothing to act upon.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think it would discharge the conferees at least.

The SPEAKER. Section 6562 of Hinds' Precedents shows that Speaker Reed said:

The Chair hardly sees how the House can agree to a report in which nothing is done. \* \* \* The Chair will have the precedents examined, but his impression is that there is nothing to agree to. \* \* \* There is no legislation in it.

Mr. ADAMSON. It would be easy for the House to agree that the conferees had done nothing. Then they could be discharged.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin was that the House further insist. The Chair would think that it was the intention of the House to discharge the conferees. It would be in order to agree to the conference report if they want to hang it up here so as to take it up again.

Mr. ADAMSON. So far as we know, we are done with it.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, what harm can there be by leaving the matter in statu quo?

Mr. ADAMSON. The papers could not be sent back unless the conference report is adopted.

Mr. GARNER. Unless it is wearing the gentleman from Georgia or pressing upon him very hard, this duty of being a conferee, the matter could remain just as it is until the end of the session.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Would it be in order to move that the report of the conferees be accepted and the conferees discharged?

Mr. ADAMSON. I think the adoption of the report would do that.

The SPEAKER. If this conference report is agreed to, these conferees are automatically discharged. These papers belong to the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Then, the papers could not be sent back to the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The Chair believes it is in order to act on this conference report. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] to agree to the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### MUNICIPALLY OWNED INTERSTATE RAILWAYS.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 455, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is that one of the bills that came over this morning?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; it came over this morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 455, with Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 455) entitled "An act to define the rights and privileges of the trustees of municipally owned interstate railways, and construing the act to regulate commerce with reference thereto."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing an article in Collier's Weekly, entitled "What happened in California."

Mr. MANN. Entitled what?

Mr. RANDALL. "What happened in California."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an article from Collier's entitled "What happened in California." Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota, Mr. McARTHUR, and Mr. BARNHART reserved the right to object.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege affecting the honor and dignity of this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania rises to a question of high privilege, which he will state.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the matter to which I desire to direct the attention of the House is of such importance that I would like to have a full attendance of the Members, but in order to save time for the passage of a great preparedness bill I shall not insist upon the point of no quorum at this time. [Applause.] It is patent to anyone who reads the newspapers—

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURNETT. Has the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] been disposed of? I do not think the gentleman wants to interfere with him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is going to reserve the right and there is going to be debate, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has the floor on a question of high privilege.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a prelude to the question of privilege which I am about to present, I wish to say it is apparent to anyone who reads the daily newspapers that the war issue is being very much befogged by reports from London and that there has been a wonderful change in editorial sentiment in certain papers during the last six months.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman that the first thing to do is to state the question of privilege, if any, that he has. The Chair will then pass upon that first.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record, which consent was granted by the House. He did not read the remarks, and they were not read to the House. They were buried under leave in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I question whether a single newspaper in the United States has taken cognizance of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. This, Mr. Speaker, is what the gentleman from Texas printed in the Record, and it constitutes, as I believe, a question of the highest privilege, involving the honor of the House:

"In March, 1915, the J. P. Morgan interests, the steel, ship-building, and powder interests, and their subsidiary organizations, got together 12 men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the



United States and sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.

"These 12 men worked the problem out by selecting 179 newspapers, and then began, by an elimination process, to retain only those necessary for the purpose of controlling the general policy of the daily press throughout the country. They found it was only necessary to purchase the control of 20 of the greatest papers. The 25 papers were agreed upon; emissaries were sent to purchase the policy, national and international, of these papers; an agreement was reached; the policy of the papers was bought, to be paid for by the month; an editor was furnished for each paper to properly supervise and edit information regarding the questions of preparedness, militarism, financial policies, and other things of national and international nature considered vital to the interests of the purchasers.

"This contract is in existence at the present time, and it accounts for the news columns of the daily press of the country being filled with all sorts of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy, and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes.

"This policy also included the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served. The effectiveness of this scheme has been conclusively demonstrated by the character of stuff carried in the daily press throughout the country since March, 1915. They have resorted to anything necessary to commercialize public sentiment and sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under the false pretense that it was necessary. Their stock argument is that it is 'patriotism.' They are playing on every prejudice and passion of the American people."

Here is where the question of privilege comes in.

And sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under the false pretense that it was necessary. Their stock argument is "patriotism." They are playing on every prejudice and passion of the American people.

That, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit, constitutes a question of privilege affecting the honor of the House. If we are being "sandbagged" by prejudice or through false commercialistic reports, it is injurious to the House and the country.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARNER. To make the point of order that the question suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not a question of high privilege under the rules of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the Speaker will bear with me, I think I can connect this up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman, is he rising to a question of personal privilege or a question of the highest privilege of the House?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no personal interest except the welfare of my country. I rise—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is rising to a privilege of the House, he should introduce a resolution or proposition.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was about to suggest—

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest that the gentleman ask unanimous consent to use 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for five minutes—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question before he begins?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman explain what he understands the word "sandbag" to mean in that connection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It means to drive the Congress into a corner on this war question; to make us believe we are in a state of war.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Are not the editorial arguments intended to influence Congress?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think so.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is what it means.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Unquestionably; and in further answer to the question of the gentleman I will read one article. I can not read many. I will let most of them stand aside, because I can not read them in 10 minutes; but sufficient for the present is an article from the New York Sun of Sunday.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not yield. The headlines are these—and it is the headlines that are influencing the country:

Britain chafes over United States delay.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER again rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not. I regret it, but I do not unless I can get more time. These headlines continue:

What constitutes an overt act? London public and press are asking.

And then:

Americans are cheered.

In London—remember, this is from London!

Bands play "Hail Columbia," but elation is changing to impatience.

London, gentlemen, seems to be "impatient" because the United States is not going into war. The spirit of London as translated by these American newspapers is that the United States unduly hesitates to join Great Britain in the war.

I will not go on with these editorials, which are urging the President and Congress to declare war. Some of them are so vicious as to suggest a lack of the American spirit of justice and fair play. Every man who reads the newspapers knows the tone and sentiment of these editorials. I will be content with that for the present.

But here is something more to the point than a mere expression of opinion. Here is a three-column advertisement in one of the great newspapers, and I understand it has gone into all the great newspapers of the country to influence public sentiment. Under display headlines in large type it reads:

To the American people:

Germany is at war with the United States. The repudiation of past pledges and the threat to destroy our ships and citizens without warning constituted a virtual declaration of war.

Who says this? The President of the United States? The Congress of the United States, which is the only power under the Constitution that can declare war? No! Who is it, then, that makes this bold declaration to the common people of this land that we are now at war with Germany? I have not time to read the whole article, but will insert it in the RECORD. It continues:

It is no longer a question whether there shall be war with Germany. There is war with Germany.

This is underscored. Then the declaration continues:

The only question is whether our Government shall submit at Germany's dictation to the outrages of her submarine warfare, or whether it shall forcibly defend American property.

There is no discussion here, mark you, of the right of American ships to go through an English blockade, no question of "the freedom of the seas," so far as Great Britain's domination of the seas is concerned. This declaration is a declaration that we are "at war with Germany"; it implies that we must join the allies to beat Germany. I regret I can not read it all, for several prominent names are attached to this pronunciamento. There are quotations from Charles W. Eliot and Nicholas Murray Butler. Let them go for what they are worth. These men are publicists and are giving information almost daily about the manner in which we should govern ourselves.

But this advertisement, paid for by somebody, continues:

President Wilson and the Congress desire assurances of the country's backing before declaring war.

Who says President Wilson and the Congress are seeking assurances of somebody's backing before they declare war? Let us see:

Telegraph the President and your Congressman, pledging to them your loyal support in immediate and vigorous action for the defense of the American rights and American honor, and urging formal recognition of the state of war already existing between Germany and the United States.

This remarkable war message is signed by the "American Rights League" and certain individuals. Fortunately those who sign it do not hide themselves under cover of the "American Rights League"; they attach their names to it; to this voluntary, this diabolical declaration of war against a foreign country before the President of the United States or the Congress of the United States have acted upon a matter of such grave importance to the masses of our people.

Those whose names are appended to this paper include Dr. Lyman Abbot, of New York, and Rev. Randolph H. McKim, pastor of a church in Washington, two members of the profession which is supposed to teach the doctrine of "Peace on Earth."

God save the mark! If our good Lord and Savior were to come upon this earth to-day and be shown this hasty and bitter demand for war by one of His own ministers, or one professing to be a Christian minister, I question whether the Rev. Randolph McKim would stay in his pulpit in Washington a single hour. [Applause.]



I can not go on with this much further; in 10 minutes I am unable to cover the main subject. I wish to observe, however, that I am neither pro-German, as some of the newspapers have recently insisted, nor am I pro-ally. I am, as this Congress ought to be, pro-American [applause], and nothing else. If it has come to that point where we must forget the history of this Nation, must obliterate the record we have made to attain our present position, or if we are to forget that once we severed the yoke that bound us and must put that yoke again upon our necks, I want to leave these congressional halls forever.

I have in my hand a little of the information that this House should have to better understand this situation. I shall refer to it, hoping that somebody upon the other side will introduce a resolution in order that we may get additional information about the influences that are said to be doctoring the newspaper sentiment of the United States in the interest of one of the great belligerents, trying to drag us into war that we may "pull their chestnuts out of the fire." And that I may not be misunderstood, let me say that I want no dictation from the Kaiser any more than I want it from Lloyd-George. I want no dictation from Lord Northcliffe, the head of the great newspaper fraternity of Great Britain, with certain alliances in the United States, any more than I would accept it from Von Hindenberg. [Applause.] Let it be understood that I want to be free as an American Representative—as I assume all of us do—to help rule this country as our country and its people ought to be ruled, free from any domination in the whole world, and free from any mercenaries, whether they be in the pulpit or in the banking house. [Applause.]

Among the numerous letters that have come to me in the last few days, Mr. Speaker, was one inclosing this interesting message from Sir Gilbert Parker. Sir Gilbert, as you know, is a great writer; he is a novelist and an able editorial director. Sir Gilbert Parker has been shipping volume after volume into the United States to show how friendly Great Britain is with this country and how "blood is thicker than water." The argument has been that we ought to join forces with Great Britain to down Germany and the other nations with which it is in conflict. In this circular Right Hon. Sir Gilbert Parker, who is now in America and has recently visited the Capital, says:

"As Sir Gilbert Parker is sailing for America on Saturday, January 13, he will be unable to deal with any correspondence until further notice. He has, however, made arrangements for pamphlets to be sent out during his absence. He begs to thank his many correspondents for their kindness and courtesy during the past two years and a half, and he hopes to have the pleasure of meeting many of them while in the United States."

"20 Carlton House Terrace, London, S. W., England."

My friends in Congress, my pro-American friends who still believe in Washington's Farewell Address against entangling alliances, my native American friends who feel that this is a country worth fighting for and worth having and worth holding, I wish to give you a word of caution about every insidious story that is cabled from the other side of the water to provoke your passions. Able writers are telling you and your constituents to get into this struggle, but you want to be sure of your ground—sure that you are not serving some selfish purpose of men or nations—before you break up the peace of the United States and plunge us into this bloody controversy.

I admit we have a certain responsibility. We have provided in the interest of the great shippers a War-Risk Bureau, which is guaranteeing safe conduct to cargoes; cargoes carrying what? These little children that are so often discussed as being destroyed at sea? Are we guaranteeing their safe passage? No; with a \$5,000,000 fund from our Treasury we are guaranteeing the safe passage of munitions ships that are sent across the water, not to break a British blockade, not to establish our right to trade with Germany or any neutral country. No; we are doing this to maintain our trade with only some of the belligerents. The maintenance of that trade with a single country is the compelling reason with these warlike editorial writers. We have a fine opportunity for trade in South America, but the seas are not wholly free to us; our ships have to be O. K'd by one of the great powers before American business can be done. We can not deal with any neutral nation without the consent of one of the great powers which assumes to be "mistress of the seas." But we have this Government war-risk insurance chiefly, I fear, for the sake of those who are commercially interested in the conduct of war, and with the permission and approval of one of the great nations.

And then, again, there is our financial interest. We have taken approximately \$2,000,000,000 of bonds of foreign powers. They are scattered amongst our investors, and unless the war is successful, unless some of these editorial writers can convince

us that "blood is thicker than water," so that we shall send our boys into this war, the money we have invested in these foreign securities may be lost. Great God! Have we come to this in the United States, here in the Hall of our fathers, the Hall in which we determined the fate of America, the Hall in which we have fought out our great battles, the Hall in which we have resisted foreign aggression, the Hall in which we have dared to stand for our rights from colonial days—has it come to this, that because we are told by a great power or by great newspapers that money is at stake we must go in and fight a foreign war or lose it all? Shall we for this forget our altars and our firesides, and shall all of the hallowed and patriotic inspirations of our country stand for naught? [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I hope some Democrat will introduce a resolution to investigate these charges of pernicious editorial activity to stir up war and bloodshed as they were presented in the RECORD by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]. If that be not done, though the session be short, I shall introduce such a resolution myself, let the chips fall where they may. [Applause.] It is due to honest and patriotic journalism in the United States.

#### PLATTSBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the Plattsburg Chamber of Commerce, indorsing the action of the President of the United States in severing diplomatic relations with Germany.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

PLATTSBURG, N. Y., February 13, 1917.

HON. BERTRAND H. SNELL,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The Plattsburg Chamber of Commerce in a resolution, copy of which was to-day transmitted to President Wilson, indorse the President's action in severing diplomatic relations with Germany, and we express the desire to aid in every way possible in carrying out whatever action the President may deem wise. We are distinctly and unanimously opposed to any attempt being made to influence the President or to hamper him in any way in his commendable efforts to maintain the honor of the United States and the recognized principles of international law.

PLATTSBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
W. B. JACQUES, President.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20632, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy shall build any of the vessels herein appropriated for in such navy yards as he may designate should it reasonably appear that the persons, firms, or corporations, or the agents thereof, bidding for the construction of any of said vessels have entered into any combination, agreement, or understanding, the effect, object, or purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, and unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of said vessels: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to build any of the vessels herein authorized in such navy yards as he may designate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order. I do not quite understand the purpose of the proviso to this paragraph. The paragraph first provides that the Secretary shall build any of the vessels herein appropriated for in such yards as he may designate should it reasonably appear that the persons, firms, or corporations, or the agents thereof, and so forth, have entered into any combination. Then the proviso is that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to build any of the vessels authorized in the bill in such navy yards as he may designate. We make an appropriation for all of the vessels, do we not?

Mr. PADGETT. Under the three-year program we are building a definite number of ships. For instance, 10 battleships were authorized. Last year we appropriated for 4 of the 10, and this year for 3.

Mr. MANN. I do not understand this part of it. Do not we appropriate in this bill for all of the vessels which are authorized in the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. We appropriate not for all that are authorized, but we appropriate for a part of what were authorized last year.



Mr. MANN. Do we not appropriate in this bill for a part of the vessels authorized in the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, we make some appropriation in this bill for all of the vessels that are authorized.

Mr. PADGETT. No. Let me explain to the gentleman. In the bill of last year we authorized 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 20 destroyers, and 58 submarines.

Mr. MANN. And we appropriate for all of those in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. When we make the appropriation it will be in this bill, but we have not yet made the appropriations for all of them.

Mr. MANN. No; but we are appropriating in this bill some money for each of those vessels?

Mr. PADGETT. No; not for all of them. We appropriated last year for 4 of the 10 battleships, and did not make any appropriation for 6. This year the appropriations are made for three additional battleships, leaving three battleships that we authorized last year that are not yet appropriated for.

Mr. MANN. I do not get it; but this is perfectly plain: If we authorized vessels last year and they are not appropriated for this year, this bill does not authorize them to be constructed in navy yards.

Mr. PADGETT. They are not to be constructed at all; that is, 3 of the 10 battleships which we authorized are not yet to be constructed.

Mr. MANN. What is the difference in this paragraph between the proviso and the main paragraph?

Mr. PADGETT. There is very little, I will say to the gentleman, and this is the language that has been carried year after year. The proviso is very little different from the other, except that it says the Secretary is authorized to build any of the vessels authorized in such navy yards as he may designate. The first part of it provides that he shall build any of the vessels authorized in such navy yards as he may designate should it reasonably appear that persons, firms, or corporations bidding for the construction have entered into any combination. The first part of it is to provide against combinations and the last part of it authorizes him to build them in any navy yard, regardless of combination.

Mr. MANN. Suppose the shipbuilding yards should combine so that only one yard should bid on any one ship, but that each of them would bid on a ship and bid at a lower price than the Government could construct the ship for in the navy yards. Under this, then, the Secretary would still have to construct them in the navy yards.

Mr. PADGETT. He may build them in the navy yards, but he is not directed to. It is in his discretion.

Mr. MANN. I should say that he is directed to.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MANN. That is what the bill says. Suppose there are three navy yards and each one of them bids on a ship.

Mr. PADGETT. Does the gentleman mean private contracting yards? When the gentleman says "navy yards" I understand him to refer to Government yards, and when he says "shipyards" I understand him to refer to private shipbuilding companies.

Mr. MANN. Very well. Say three shipbuilding yards bid, and each one bids on a ship by combination, but each one bids at a lower price than the Government can construct the ship in a Government navy yard, then the Government would still have to construct the ship in the navy yard under this provision.

Mr. PADGETT. That is not the interpretation that has been given it. If private contractors bid lower than the navy yards can build them for, they get the contract.

Mr. MANN. The paragraph says:

Or purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, and unrestricted competition.

These men may combine and each one bid for a ship. These different shipyards probably can not each build three ships. You advertise for the construction of three ships, and each private yard agrees to bid on one ship and bid at a lower price than the Government constructs them. Under this language you could not construct a ship. This is new language in the law.

Mr. PADGETT. No; this has been in the law all the time; we have not changed a word of it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. This was in the last bill and in the bill before, word for word.

Mr. PADGETT. It has been in every bill for a number of years. It is not new language.

Mr. MANN. I was under the impression that it was new language. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the event the Secretary of the Navy is unable to secure from the private shipbuilders contracts for the expeditious construction of the ships heretofore authorized at a fair and reasonable price, the sum of

\$12,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to enable the Secretary of the Navy to equip the navy yards with suitable and necessary machinery, implements, building ways, and equipment for the construction of such of said vessels as may be assigned to navy yards for construction.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. In view of the amendment agreed to yesterday authorizing the President in war time or in time of emergency to commandeer the shipyards and have the ships built at private yards at a price to be agreed upon, and if that can not be agreed upon, then to be submitted to the Court of Claims for decision, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether he thinks it is necessary to now go ahead with the policy of putting all the shipyards in a condition to make them capable of building all kinds of naval ships?

Mr. PADGETT. I think we need them to carry out the program that they have authorized independent of the legislation that was authorized yesterday by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Last year we appropriated \$6,000,000 for the equipment of navy yards, giving preference, as far as the battleship program is concerned, to New York, Philadelphia, Mare Island, and Norfolk.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was this \$6,000,000 inadequate for the purpose named?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Or is it intended by this to equip other yards?

Mr. PADGETT. No; but the \$6,000,000 was inadequate for the purpose for which this appropriation was made. This is to be added to the appropriation to carry out the purposes expressed in that appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the \$6,000,000 was only to be for two yards—New York and Mare Island—but in the Senate they included the other yards.

Mr. PADGETT. No; the Senate did not extend the number. The House provision carried the same yards designated as the law finally was agreed upon.

Mr. STAFFORD. I now recall that the gentleman is correct, the committee only recommended two, but in the Committee of the Whole they extended it to others. Is it the plan to confine this appropriation of \$12,000,000 to the equipment of those yards?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary has stated that it was his idea to have the yards at New York, Philadelphia, Mare Island, and Norfolk equipped for capital ships, battleships, and battle cruisers; the yard at Bremerton, Seattle, for the construction of ships of twelve or fifteen thousand tons displacement, not capital ships, and then the other yards mentioned, for instance, Portsmouth, N. H., and Charleston, S. C., for the construction of small craft like submarines and gunboats.

Mr. STAFFORD. How far has the department proceeded with the authorization for equipment of yards?

Mr. PADGETT. A few days ago the Senate passed a resolution calling upon the Secretary to furnish that information, and I have the reply of the Secretary, which I will read if the gentleman desires. The Secretary says:

No fixed apportionment or distribution of the entire \$6,000,000 appropriation has been made to these various yards, but it has been decided to fit up the Philadelphia yard for battle-cruiser construction, and the cost will be in the neighborhood of \$3,000,000; the Norfolk yard for dreadnaught construction, to cost about \$1,250,000; the Puget Sound yard for auxiliary ships of 12,000 tons, to cost about \$750,000; the Charleston yard for gunboats and destroyers, to cost about \$300,000; the Boston yard is already equipped to build a ship of 12,000 tons, and it will require \$75,000 to extend ways and other improvements; and the Portsmouth yard for the construction of submarines, to cost about \$200,000.

These plans are dependent upon the extent of the improvement of the various yards for shipbuilding and it may be necessary to recast and alter some of the authorizations already made, the general plan at present being tentative and subject to change in case my recommendations for an additional appropriation of \$12,000,000, for fitting the navy yards for shipbuilding, is approved by Congress.

Then he goes on to speak about various other yards.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that nothing has been done as to the six million authorization.

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing in a definite and conclusive way. In a tentative way he has made an apportionment and signified this purpose or intention of using it. But he has not concluded it in such a way as not being subject to change.

Mr. STAFFORD. Everything is in the air so far as the \$6,000,000 authorization is concerned.

Mr. PADGETT. As I say, nothing is definitely concluded.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there are two yards we are going ahead equipping for battleship construction, the New York and the Mare Island yards.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.



Mr. STAFFORD. That was under an authorization some time prior in an amendment to a prior bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and supplemented by this \$6,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order. Last year we appropriated \$6,000,000 and authorized the extension of four navy yards for the construction of capital ships. Is it still the intention to provide these navy yards with facilities for the construction of capital ships?

Mr. PADGETT. The confusion is so great that I can not hear the gentleman. It is not the fault of the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Last year we appropriated \$6,000,000 and authorized four navy yards to be equipped for the construction of capital ships.

Mr. PADGETT. In the discretion of the Secretary; yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. We authorized them?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; we authorized them.

Mr. MANN. Is it the intention now to equip those four navy yards for the construction of capital ships?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is not so indicated by the Secretary in this letter. We authorized six, if I remember.

Mr. MANN. No; we authorized four, namely, Boston, Norfolk, Philadelphia, and Puget Sound.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, he does not purpose to equip Boston and Puget Sound for the construction of ships of a capital character, but, as stated in this letter, of about 12,000 or 15,000 displacement.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know how much of this \$12,000,000 is to be expended in those two navy yards, Philadelphia and Norfolk, in order to equip them for the construction of capital ships?

Mr. PADGETT. A good part of it would be, but there is no definite plan or division of the amount.

Mr. MANN. Has there been any estimate made of what it will cost? We were told last year that \$6,000,000 would do the business.

Mr. PADGETT. No. The gentleman is a little mistaken in that.

Mr. MANN. Well, we got the impression—I did, anyhow—that \$6,000,000 would do the business.

Mr. PADGETT. That \$6,000,000 last year originated with myself after the House put a provision on the bill for a 20 per cent bonus. It occurred to me that if we had a 20 per cent bonus for speed or for construction there might be a combination that would leave the Government powerless to defend itself, and without consulting the Navy Department or anyone else, I offered the amendment on my own initiative and responsibility, naming \$6,000,000 to enable the department to equip the yards so as to protect them against any combination formed, if I may use the word, to gobble up the 20 per cent premium or bonus. That originated with myself.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman last year guessed \$6,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And the guess was not a good one. And the gentleman is guessing \$12,000,000 more, which makes \$18,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Navy sent down a letter with reference to the \$12,000,000, which is printed in the hearings on page 925.

Mr. MANN. Very well. How much of that \$12,000,000 is to be used in equipping those yards for the construction of capital ships? If the Secretary gave any information on the subject, I would be glad to have it. If he did not give any information on the subject, it is still just a wild guess.

Mr. PADGETT. I am just looking to see—

Mr. MANN. It seems to me when we are appropriating \$18,000,000—first a guess of \$6,000,000 and then a guess of \$12,000,000 more—it is only fair that we have some information and estimate as to what the cost will be. Of course, a few million dollars is nothing to a rich gentleman, but it would be a good deal to me.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Navy in his letter on the \$12,000,000 enters into a discussion of the cost and the situation of construction in the private yards. In the hearings before the committee Admiral Harris, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, indicated to the committee that the \$12,000,000, added to the \$6,000,000 heretofore appropriated, would equip the yards intended for capital-ship construction and the smaller yards for the smaller construction.

Mr. MANN. Well, how much of it goes to the equipment of yards for the construction of capital ships?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not give it to you, because I do not remember his apportionments. If I can find it here, I will try to give it to you.

Mr. MANN. Well, I should say it is important information to have. Does the Naval Committee think that \$12,000,000 is such a small sum that it is not worth inquiring about it?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. We did inquire about it, but I do not have the hearings just in front of me.

Mr. MANN. I do not think anybody has the information. That is a remarkable proposition. We appropriated \$6,000,000 for a purpose last year and propose to appropriate \$12,000,000 this year, and apparently nobody in the Navy or nobody on the Naval Affairs Committee knows what it is for.

Mr. PADGETT. It is for the equipment of yards.

Mr. MANN. How much for the capital ships?

Mr. PADGETT. I told you that specific item was in the \$12,000,000. I can not give it to you offhand.

Mr. MANN. I notice that every member of the distinguished Committee on Naval Affairs is looking it up now, and no one of them can find it. It has gotten so that \$12,000,000 is a mere bagatelle. One of them says, "What is \$12,000,000—a little thing like that?" It is a good deal to the fellows who pay it.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to suggest to the chairman that the testimony is on page 1211 of the supplemental hearing—Admiral Harris's testimony and the testimony of the Secretary.

Mr. MANN. I feel very sure the Committee on Naval Affairs would know if they ever had the information given to them.

Mr. KELLEY. We do know.

Mr. MANN. What is it? How much is to be used for the equipment of yards for the construction of the capital ships?

Mr. KELLEY. Admiral Harris testified that it would take the whole \$6,000,000 appropriated last year to fix up the Philadelphia yard alone.

Mr. MANN. That is all right so far as it goes. The letter of the Secretary just indicated \$3,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. It says here that the \$18,000,000, as I stated to the gentleman in the beginning, has not been allotted. The \$6,000,000 has been allotted tentatively.

Mr. MANN. In other words, no one knows what it is going to cost.

Mr. PADGETT. It has not been allotted for two reasons. In other words, if we get it, the \$18,000,000, we can allot it more wisely.

Mr. MANN. If they get the \$18,000,000 they can spend it. That is as far as it goes. There is absolutely no information furnished to the House as to how the \$18,000,000 is going to be expended. Where \$6,000,000 was appropriated last year for the purpose, \$12,000,000 is about to be appropriated this year, and nobody seems to think it important enough to know what it is for.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I wanted to read for the information of the gentleman from the supplemental hearings on page 1011.

Mr. PADGETT. I had that right here, just ready to read it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I read:

Mr. ROBERTS. If you should get this \$12,000,000 more, making \$18,000,000 altogether, you would rearrange your present tentative plans for the improvement of certain yards?

Secretary DANIELS. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. So as to improve to a greater extent than you contemplated?

Secretary DANIELS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTS. I understand Admiral Harris to say that it will take \$6,000,000 to equip the Philadelphia yard to build two battle cruisers?

Admiral HARRIS. I said, that, approximately.

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes; approximately. How much will it take to equip the Norfolk yard to build one?

Admiral HARRIS. That was one battle cruiser and two scouts. That was approximately \$6,000,000, too.

Mr. ROBERTS. That would take \$6,000,000. How much would it take to equip the Brooklyn yard to build two battle cruisers?

Admiral HARRIS. About \$3,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTS. And the Bremerton yard?

Admiral HARRIS. \$2,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTS. To build two battle cruisers?

Admiral HARRIS. No; to build a scout, and an ammunition ship.

Mr. ROBERTS. Are you going to build an overhead track?

Admiral HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How much will it take to build that overhead structure?

Admiral HARRIS. I do not know the exact cost, but the general estimate is about \$2,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. And how much will the traveling structure cost?

Admiral HARRIS. I think something like \$650,000.

Mr. BROWNING. You are going to build an overhead structure at Philadelphia?

Admiral HARRIS. Yes; at Philadelphia we have no covering. It is just an open-topped structure.

Mr. BUTLER. It is not like the one at New York, a shed?

Admiral HARRIS. No; it will be just open.

Mr. ROBERTS. How much of this \$18,000,000 do you expect to spend on the Charleston yard?



Admiral HARRIS. We made no estimate for Charleston, Boston, and Portsmouth, but generally assumed that \$1,000,000 would cover the improvements at those three yards.

Mr. BRITTEN. For the building of those three ships?

Admiral HARRIS. We have a ship now under construction at Boston, and the ways would have to be lengthened and additional tools would have to be provided there. At Charleston we have ways for one gunboat, and we expect to lengthen it for a destroyer, and perhaps build an additional set of ways for a destroyer.

At Portsmouth it would be just a case of another ways for a submarine.

That approximately accounts for \$18,000,000. If the gentleman will only have a little patience with us and go through this testimony we will give him all the information we have.

Mr. MANN. Oh, you ought to have the information at your tongue's end. A moment ago the chairman read a letter from the Secretary of the Navy proposing to spend \$3,000,000 at the Philadelphia yard.

Mr. PADGETT. I said they proposed to spend \$3,000,000 out of the \$6,000,000. At the same time it was stated that if the \$12,000,000 was appropriated the plans for the \$3,000,000 expenditure were tentative and would be changed and adapted to the whole amount, which would be \$6,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. I will say, in addition to what the gentleman from Tennessee has said that it makes a great deal of difference whether these yards are fitted up to build one capital ship or to build two capital ships.

Mr. MANN. That means that we are just blindly appropriating money. They will start in to equip the yard for two capital ships, and then ask for \$18,000,000 more. Who knows?

Mr. PADGETT. The proposition under this \$6,000,000 was to equip one to build a capital ship.

Mr. MANN. I have not had the opportunity to get the information until this morning, and I have not got it this morning. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, with great regret. I think we ought to know about these things when we are asked to appropriate millions of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE]. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAGUE: Page 60, line 14, after the word "yards," insert the following: "At Puget Sound, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Charleston, and New Orleans."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope that amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the same language that was adopted in the bill of last year when the question of appropriating money for the equipment of the navy yards was under consideration. The \$6,000,000 was put into the bill because of the position taken by Members from Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and other States where the navy yards belonging to the Government are located.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are asked to-day to appropriate \$12,000,000 more, which makes \$18,000,000, and we are told by the chairman of the committee that it is going to take three or four million dollars to equip any one yard.

Now, Mr. Chairman, coming from Boston, where we have a navy yard which to-day is almost equipped for first-class shipbuilding, notwithstanding the statement made by the Navy Department, I want to say that the navy yard in Boston could be equipped for the building of a first-class battleship by an expenditure of less than half a million dollars, and could be put in a condition to build one of these battleships, or commence the building of battleships, within one year.

It is all very well, Mr. Chairman, to ask for these big appropriations, and I am willing to vote them when the Government wants them; but it has been debated on this floor that the reason why we have been unable to build these ships is that the private shipyards have not been in a position to take the contracts and do not want them. In other words, the big shipbuilding companies of the United States do not want their ways taken up in the building of a battleship that is going to take three years, and that is the reason why the Government has been unable to secure bids from these large concerns for the construction of battleships which this country needs so much at the present time.

I think it is good business, Mr. Chairman, for the Government to have its own property equipped as soon as possible so that we will not be in the hands or at the mercy of any private shipyard in the country. We have these big institutions now, and with a slight expenditure of money they can be equipped, and the amount of money authorized in this bill, which is nothing compared with the bonus which we will be obliged to pay to the large shipbuilding companies, will be saved in the equipment of the Government's own yards. We

are building to-day, or about to build in Boston Navy Yard, a hospital ship of about 12,000 tons, and the Secretary says it will require \$75,000 to build the ways for the building of this ship.

We have in the yard a splendid equipment, and all that is necessary is the extension of ways and some new machinery to put that yard in a first-class condition. We have everything that the Government wants there. We have 35 feet of water right at the navy yard. We have a splendid machine shop that has been equipped by the Government in the past few years. We have the largest chain shop in the United States, building all the big chains and most of the anchors for the Navy. We have a ropewalk, where we make all the big hawsers and cables that the Navy uses. Then we have a steel plant for the making of castings to be used by the Navy Department. We have everything that is needed in that yard to-day to go ahead and proceed with in building the ships the Government needs so much at the present time, and we are told that the appropriations are going in other directions.

I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Chairman, that the other navy yards of the country should be equipped, no matter what the expense is to the Government. It is a shame to see our Government at the mercy of any individual or corporation at a time like this, when we need a Navy so badly and we are compelled to have laws passed to allow us to go into the private shipyards and take over their plants and machinery to do the work of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. Does the gentleman know that the Government has had no trouble whatever in getting bids for battleships? They are awarded at once, and are now under contract at two yards.

Mr. GORDON. Under contract but not under construction.

Mr. BROWNING. They are under construction.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in the debate that has taken place on this floor every member of the minority of the committee who has spoken here has said, "We have appropriated the money, but the ships are not built, the ships can not be built for more than four years. That is the matter with our Navy—we can not get the bids to build them until the ways of these private shipyards are cleared of the private work that they are now constructing."

Mr. BROWNING. Can they be built more quickly in Government yards?

Mr. TAGUE. Oh, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BROWNING. Well, answer my question.

Mr. TAGUE. Yes; and better.

Mr. BROWNING. The Secretary says they can not, and the Assistant Secretary says so, too.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary has taken the word of men who have filled volume after volume in contradicting one another on every phase of the building of the American Navy. Mr. Chairman, I contend that there is not a private shipyard to-day in the country that can be cleared so that this Government can start to build a ship inside of a year. According to the reports we get every yard is filled now with private construction, and why should we interfere with that work when the people of the Nation need these private ships so much, and when we have property of our own which we should use, and when we are appropriating millions of dollars for the building up of our own Navy? Then we are told we must go to the private shipyards to have that done.

Mr. BROWNING. Does the gentleman know that there are two concerns in this country, the New York Shipbuilding Co. and the Newport News Shipbuilding Co.—and the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. as well—whose yards are 72 per cent engaged in Government construction?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes; I know they have 72 per cent of their yards engaged; but still we are without the ships; still they are unable to give us any more ships for four or five or six years.

Mr. BROWNING. And the Secretary of the Navy and the private shipyard men all say that the trouble is to get the labor. There is only a certain amount of labor in this country, and none of them can get it.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the reason for that is perfectly natural. The shipbuilding of the world has been done across



the water, and it was not until the present condition arose which was the result of the war that the people of the United States realized that it was time to protect their own industries and build up their own merchant marine.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, when this matter was before the committee I asked Admiral Taylor this question:

If the private yards are completely fitted up, and if the Government yards are fitted up, making that many more shipyards, pending the time when this general shipbuilding boom is on, where would you expect to get the men to equip and do the work in the Government yards?

Admiral TAYLOR. We would expect to get them from the shipbuilding trade.

I asked:

To get them away from the private shipbuilders?

Admiral TAYLOR. The estimates of the Department of Commerce indicate that there are about 70,000 men employed in the shipbuilding trade to-day outside of the navy yards. In the navy yards we have employed about 25,000 men. In order to build this work we would need to have on the average something like 7,000 or 8,000 more men.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Boston where the Government yards would get at this time 7,000 or 8,000 more men?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman I will just bring to his attention this fact: Up to within three years at the navy yard in my district there was no shipbuilding, the only work done being repair work. Up to within the last 10 years the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. did practically no shipbuilding, except in a small way. They employed a few men, to be sure. I understand that now they are employing many thousands of men. We have in the Boston Navy Yard to-day, working on shipbuilding and the different parts of shipbuilding, 3,300 men, where three years ago we had 1,900 men. Over 800 of those men to-day are working in shipbuilding. It is true you can not get mechanics in a moment. But every mechanic in the United States who is engaged in any part of machinery building, any part of iron working, any part of structural work, can with a little experience adapt himself to the work of building battleships. After all, what is it? The turning out of the iron is done in the mill. It requires a good mechanic, who knows iron, to put it together. They can turn out ship fitters, Mr. Chairman, as fast as they can get the men to work at it, and we have never had any trouble in getting men to go in and learn the trade of shipbuilding. It has become a substantial trade to-day in the United States. It has become a trade that the young men realize is going to be a profitable one. There will be no trouble in getting men to learn the trade. They will go into the yard and under good instruction they will become splendid ship fitters in a very short while. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that if the report of the chairman of the committee is true, that it will take 7,500 more men to work in the navy yards in the work of the building of our ships, we can get them in a very short time. If we can build a 12,000-ton ship, we can build a 20,000-ton ship, and it will not take much money to equip Boston yard in comparison to the amount of money, \$18,000,000, which we are now appropriating. All we ask this House to do is to give us the opportunity to demonstrate that we can do the work for the Government and save money doing so.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, in the State of Pennsylvania is one great industrial concern that has put up its word that within 60 days from this time it will start in the construction of submarines and will agree to give the Government one submarine each week, or 52 submarines each year. In the same State is a concern that has offered its services and its plant to this Government, and has agreed that within 10 months or 1 year it will be ready for the construction of destroyers, and that it will build for this Government 26 destroyers every year. Do you think these people are responding? Do you think their word is good? In the big city of Chester, close to Philadelphia, a shipbuilding plant has recently been constructed and is now ready for commercial work. Its president, who is its guiding hand, Senator William C. Sprowl, has declined to cover his ways with commercial work, which he can do at once, in order that he may be ready for the Government work at any hour and to proceed to build such ships as the Government will need, excepting capital ships. I understand he has arranged already for steel to be furnished for the boats he may build for the Government. He is one of Pennsylvania's foremost citizens and his response to his country's call will not be forgotten by the grateful people of our State. To lay aside all his commercial work to serve his country is a positive sacrifice. But big men can afford to do big things and I am not surprised at Senator Sprowl's readiness and willingness. Within a very few months the shipyards of America under private control will be ready and able to supply the Government with all the small ships she can possibly use.

Mr. TAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. TAGUE. I said nothing about the smaller ships. My contention has been that the private shipyards should be left to build the smaller ships and let the Government build the ships now authorized, the battleships, and let the private yards take care of the smaller ships.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PADGETT. We are appropriating \$12,000,000 in order to enable the Government to equip all of the yards for the purpose of building ships. The gentleman from Massachusetts has offered an amendment naming seven yards, and that is the question before the House. We are opposed to naming any yards, but leave the power discretionary with the department to equip any and all yards.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. VARE. I would like to ask my colleague whether he believes that this discretion should be left with the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. BUTLER. Absolutely. I do not know where the ships can be built. I have heard of the depth of water at different places not being sufficient for shipbuilding or navy-yard purposes; I have become thoroughly confused at times, and I believe that there is not any water at some of these yards. [Laughter.] Harbors have been designated to us where our fleet could lie, but the fleet has outgrown the harbors. These conditions change and the depth of the ship changes. I would not vote in favor of any measure that would tie the hands of the Secretary of the Navy in this particular. He should be allowed to exercise his discretion in making selection among the different yards where these ships can be built if desirable, and at the least possible expense to the Government. The yards best equipped, in my judgment, should first be selected; some are better equipped than others. I have no information and I would not assume to myself the responsibility of designating to him where he should build any of the Government ships.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. Why has not the Secretary made some selection as to the equipment of yards under the appropriation that we made one year ago?

Mr. PADGETT. That was August 29, 1916.

Mr. BUTLER. Congress passed a law August 29, and it became a law a short time after that date. In that bill the Secretary was authorized, in his discretion, to equip a certain number of yards—I think eight. I believe the Secretary, the gentleman who has the responsibility, has made an effort to select yards best adapted for construction purposes. Immediately bids for equipment were asked. He has had about three months in which to determine the best places to construct the big ships. Six million dollars was given him to enable him to complete some of the yards, so that the big ships might be constructed. He has already, as I understand, designated the Philadelphia yard for the construction of one great battle cruiser of 180,000 horsepower. Such a ship has never been built in the wide world. It is entirely novel and new, almost an experiment, but one that we must adopt. He has stated that it will require a good portion of the \$6,000,000 to equip one yard. The shipbuilders who know how to build battleships have declined up to this time to name a sum satisfactory to the department for which they can build the ships. This ship to be built at the Philadelphia Navy Yard will be built under the direction of the Government. I have no doubt the contracts will be made for the other battle cruisers soon; I mean those heretofore authorized. The Secretary has been moving with dispatch. I have seen millions of dollars voted to the Philadelphia yard for improvements to put it in condition for the purpose that it is now about to be used. I know of no other yard as well equipped as the Philadelphia yard. It is the most modern and the most recent in all kinds of improvements, except the one in New York; and there is no room there to build a cruiser. The ways at the Philadelphia yard are being lengthened, and contracts already made for the steel for that purpose. The battle cruiser is about 900 feet long and of 42,000 tons. It is to carry great guns, larger than any other guns, I believe. Before the Secretary of the Navy could allot the money to the different yards he saw fit to designate one place, the better prepared, the better improved, than all of them, where he might make the immediate test of building a great cruiser.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that the length of the cruiser is about 875 feet, and the tonnage is 32,000 tons. It is the new battleships that are 42,000 tons.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I made a mistake. The cruiser is unarmored.



Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Last week, when they were speculating about the number of submarines, Mr. Gary made the statement in New York that we had an establishment here that could easily duplicate all the submarines reported to be now usable. Was that statement one of enthusiasm merely?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know what our real ability is. But did the gentleman hear my statement this morning?

Mr. FESS. As to the institution in his State?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; and it is a good one, too.

Mr. FESS. But Mr. Gary does not confine himself to Pennsylvania, does he?

Mr. BUTLER. He does not. I have no doubt that we have in the United States, in connection with our navy yards, sufficient equipment, perhaps somewhat to be improved, so that within three or four months from this time we will be able to begin the supply of all the subsidiary craft that we will at any time likely need.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, referring further to the question propounded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] awhile ago as to where the \$18,000,000 would be expended. I want to call the attention of the House to what the Secretary stated in the hearings before the committee, on page 999 of the supplementary hearings. He said:

Secretary DANIELS. But my suggestion is, our estimates and our recommendations are, for building, equipping the yards for building the ships, it would require \$18,000,000. We have already \$6,000,000, and we are asking for \$12,000,000 more, which would enable us to fit up the Portsmouth Navy Yard to build submarines, and with existing ways and one new way for two 800-ton boats. At Boston, Mass., the present ways should be lengthened and necessary plant equipment provided for continuing to build ships up to and including 12,000 tons.

Mr. ROBERTS. May I ask you, right there, are we to assume that the Portsmouth Navy Yard is not equipped to build 800-ton boats with its present slips?

Secretary DANIELS. Not fully; we must spend some money to do that.

Mr. ROBERTS. Does this increase the amount you require for the Portsmouth Yard?

Secretary DANIELS. No; we have not been able to make a detailed estimate.

At Boston we would provide the necessary ways and equipment.

At Charleston we would lengthen the present ways for a destroyer, and make one for a new destroyer. We could build both destroyers and gunboats.

At Philadelphia we would fit up two new ways for capital ships, leaving the existing ways for auxiliaries.

At Norfolk we would fit up one new battle-cruiser ways and one new ways for two scouts.

At Puget Sound, Wash., we would build one new ways for one new ammunition ship and one scout cruiser.

At New York we would build one new ways for a battle cruiser, and existing ways would be continued as at present.

Mr. FOSS rose.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on this amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] may I ask that debate upon the amendment close in 10 minutes?

Mr. FOSS. I may want 10 minutes myself, though I do not know.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to have five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Then make it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman include in that request the paragraph as well as the amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] close in 15 minutes.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has already discussed his amendment for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TAGUE. Unless I can have five minutes I object.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the pending paragraph close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, attention has already been called to the fact that we are spending a great deal of money in equipping these navy yards for the purpose of building capital ships. Last year we authorized \$6,000,000 and this year we conditionally authorize, if we carry out this provision, \$12,000,000; but that is not all. In this bill we appropriate to the different yards and stations something like \$12,000,000 in addition. I read on page 29 of the bill that the total public works will cost \$14,000,000 and over. Of that at least \$12,000,000 goes into the various yards and stations, and all for what purpose? In order that these navy yards may build capital ships, and there is not a single instance anywhere where the Government has built a capital ship that it has not cost 10, 20, 30 per cent more than a similar ship was

built for in a private yard. Yet we are building up these navy yards to construct ships at an increased expense to the Government. Let me state an instance. We have constructed seven colliers, all of them practically of the same size, with a displacement of about 19,360 tons each, with a cargo capacity for coal of 10,500 tons each, and we built them during the years 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911. Six of the seven colliers were built in private yards. The lowest cost in a private yard for any one of them was \$871,000. The highest cost in a private yard was \$1,023,000. The seventh was constructed in a Government navy yard, and that ship cost \$1,326,000—30 per cent more than the same ship or a similar ship built under private contract, and that has been the whole history of the navy-yard construction.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. Take the battleship *Utah* and the battleship *Florida*. The *Florida* was built in the New York Navy Yard and her hull and machinery cost \$6,250,000. Her sister ship, the *Utah*, was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., and it cost less than \$4,000,000. There was a difference in the cost of those two ships, sister ships, for hull and machinery, built on identically the same plans and specifications, of \$2,250,000. Then we also built a battleship, the *New York*, in the New York Navy Yard, while her sister ship, the *Texas*, was built in a private yard. We excluded indirect and overhead charges from the limit of cost upon the *New York*, and yet that ship cost half a million dollars more than the *Texas*, her sister ship, built in a private yard, and if the indirect charges, the overhead charges, which we eliminated under the act of authorization in the naval appropriation bill had been charged to the *New York* in the New York Navy Yard, that ship would have cost \$2,000,000 more than her sister ship, built under a private contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I propose to put these facts into the RECORD.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment? As I understand it, five minutes were reserved for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that in fixing the time at 15 minutes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] was to consume 10 minutes and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] 5.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, we have a number of shipyards in this country—8 or 10 or a dozen—and there never has been any combination between the different shipyards in the country that I know of or that has been shown to exist. We provide in this bill that if there should be any agreement or combination among the shipyards these ships can be built by the Secretary of the Navy in a Government navy yard.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FOSS. And if you will look through the whole history of Government construction of ships you will find that in every case we have had a half dozen bidders or more. In one case I recall seven bidders in the matter of the construction of a battleship. We have had plenty of competition, and in a time like this I believe we should give these great ships to the private ship-building concerns.

Why, much of the congestion to-day in navy yards is due to the tendency of the administration to build ships in navy yards. Just think of it, the *Tennessee* and *California*, authorized two years ago, have hardly yet been begun. And why, because they are waiting for the *New Mexico* or some other ship to get off the ways in the New York Navy Yard, and so the construction of that ship has been delayed. If that ship and her sister ship had been given to private contractors two years ago at the bids which were then made by the private contractors, those two ships would have been halfway completed at this time and at a cost of a million or a million and a half dollars less each on completion than what they will cost when they are built in the navy yards two or three years hence.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. I wanted to inquire if it is not true that the private plants are now so congested that it would be two



and a half to three years before they could take any contract from the Government?

Mr. FOSS. No; I think the private yards will take these ships, and we have already provided in the commandeering proposition here that in case of a national emergency these shipyards can be taken over by the Government, and the ships can be built at a price that shall be reasonable in the estimation of the President; and if the private building concerns do not agree to that price, why, of course, they have the alternative, a poor alternative, of a lawsuit, and yet in view of that action in this House—

Mr. TAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. In exercising its power to take over these yards in time of national emergency we propose now to appropriate \$12,000,000, in order that the Government can go into competition with private shipbuilding concerns.

Mr. VARE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. FOSS. The trouble about competition is that the cost accounting system upon which estimates are made by the Navy Department is unfair to the private shipbuilding concerns, and the Government can afford to be fair. I am going briefly to read to you here just the difference in the accounting system, where all the trouble in comparison between Government navy-yard estimates, which do not amount to anything, and bids made by responsible shipbuilding yards occurs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to put this in the Record and show the difference between the two in the matter of the cost of ships. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 19, 1916.

Hon. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. FOSS: In reply to your letter of February 5, 1916, requesting a comparative statement of the cost of building naval colliers at

navy yards and at private yards, there is submitted herewith a statement of the individual cost of seven colliers of about equal displacement. Of these vessels the *Jupiter* was constructed by the Government at the navy yard, Mare Island, Cal. The cost of plans, pay of officers, and wages paid on account of leave and holidays does not appear in the charges to this vessel, while indirect expense for supervision, power, minor maintenance charges, etc., are included in the total cost.

The following general information is given, a part of which you may desire to apply in comparing the cost of the *Jupiter* and *Cyclops*.

Naval act approved May 13, 1908, authorized two fleet colliers at a cost not to exceed \$1,800,000 each, and provided that "one of said colliers to be built in such Government yard on the Pacific coast as the Secretary of the Navy shall direct."

On account of the excessive estimate for construction at the Mare Island yard, as compared with bids submitted by private shipbuilding firms, no award was made, and the Secretary in his hearing before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, January 7, 1909, requested Congress to authorize the purchase of four colliers at no greater cost than was authorized for two in the above act.

Naval act approved March 3, 1909, reduced the limit of cost of colliers to \$900,000, but did not repeal the direction to build the vessel in a Government yard on the Pacific coast.

A recommendation was made by the Secretary of the Navy in a letter to the House Committee on Naval Affairs dated December 31, 1909, that the limit of cost of the collier to be built on the Pacific coast be increased to \$1,404,000, or that authority be granted to have this vessel built by contract. The action taken by Congress was to increase the limit of cost to \$1,000,000 (act approved June 24, 1910). No action could be taken under this limit, and by act of March 4, 1911, it was again increased to \$1,200,000, "exclusive of indirect charges," and under this limit the yard was directed to proceed with the construction.

From the above it will be noted that the direction of Congress to build the vessel in a Government yard on the Pacific coast was mandatory, that the excessive cost as compared with a contract-built vessel was contemplated, and that the construction of the vessel, while authorized in May, 1908, was not undertaken until some months after her sister ship, the *Cyclops*, was completed and in commission.

In this connection attention is invited to the accompanying statement from which it appears that on account of increased cost of material or other causes the contract prices for construction of colliers built during the period corresponding with the time when the *Jupiter* was being built at Mare Island were approximately 15 per cent greater than that under which the *Cyclops* was constructed, although the dimensions of those contracted for later were less.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,  
Secretary of the Navy.

Statement to accompany letter to Hon. G. E. Foss.

Vessel.	Displacement.	Authorized.	Builders.	Length.	Breadth.	Cargo capacity (coal).	Contract price.	Total cost.
<i>Jupiter</i> .....	19,360	May 13, 1908	Navy yard, Mare Island.....	542	65	10,457	\$1,200,000	\$1,326,111.36
<i>Cyclops</i> .....	19,360	.....do.....	Wm. Cramp & Sons.....	542	65	10,457	822,500	871,518.35
<i>Neptune</i> .....	19,375	Mar. 3, 1909	Maryland Steel Co.....	542	65	10,500	889,600	922,144.55
<i>Proteus</i> .....	19,000	June 24, 1910	Newport News Shipbuilding Co.....	522	62	10,500	990,000	998,652.53
<i>Nereus</i> .....	19,000	.....do.....	.....do.....	522	62	10,500	990,000	1,023,854.15
<i>Orion</i> .....	19,132	Mar. 4, 1911	Maryland Steel Co.....	536	65	10,500	951,000	974,479.85
<i>Jason</i> .....	19,132	.....do.....	.....do.....	536	65	10,500	951,000	971,338.01

<sup>1</sup> Limit of cost exclusive of indirect charges.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8092) confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5424) to construct a bridge in San Juan County, State of New Mexico.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. GRONNA as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, it is refreshing to find some disposition on the part of Members to ask to-day for information. In reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] as to the relative cost of construction

in private and in Government yards, I will say that he may be correct as to some of the old contracts to which he refers, but they related to a time when Government yards were ill-equipped for the handling of any business. Under a Secretary friendly to the proper development of Government yards to handle, at least, a limited quantity of Government work, the committee now finds that work done at Government yards compares most favorably, both as to cost and quality, with that let to private yards. I will later read and insert as a part of my remarks a fuller statement on this subject, and which clearly, I submit, refutes the views entertained by the gentleman from Illinois.

As a result of the information before the committee on this subject, a unanimous report has been submitted recommending this increase of \$12,000,000 to properly equip the navy yards, and the committee has felt that the expenditure of this sum should be left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, and that Congress should not undertake to specify the yards where expenditures must be made. For that reason I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] will be defeated.

I desire to now briefly submit some facts for your consideration in support of a motion to recommit this bill, which I contemplate offering at the proper time. Allusion has been made to the time required for the completion of capital ships. An amendment was offered by me on yesterday, seeking to require that the vessels appropriated for in this bill should be completed within 38 months. That amendment was voted down, and to my surprise there were many Members on this side of the aisle who voted against the amendment. Yet the report of the minority members of the committee, at the last session of this Congress, recommended and urged the following as proper



limits of time for the completion of the different types of ships:

We believe that dreadnaughts and battle cruisers can be completed and put into commission in 24 to 30 months from date of contract. We believe that scout cruisers, destroyers, and other like craft can be completed and put into commission within 15 months from date of contract and that submarines of the coast type can be completed and put in commission within 12 months from the date of contract, and that the time in which ships must be completed should be limited.

In my amendment I sought to prescribe a maximum limit of 38 months on the final completion of the capital ships and, to my surprise, the same gentlemen who said that five months ago, the time limit should be 30 months or less, now impliedly authorize the giving of 48 months, and voted against the amendment, fixing the limit at 38 months.

If we need battleships, we need them earlier than four years from now; and if you will fix a limit of time or postpone the appropriation therefor you will get them in much shorter time than four years and probably for less money. The motion to recommit will provide as follows:

Strike out all appropriations for two of the three battleships now carried in the bill and insert in lieu thereof appropriations for the construction of 30 destroyers instead of 15 and for 30 submarines instead of 18, the type and cost of such additional destroyers and submarines to be the same as those now carried in the bill.

If this motion is adopted, it will largely add to the fleet two important types that can be completed in a reasonable time and which will greatly add to the Navy's efficiency. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLIVER. Under leave granted I herewith set out letter, with attached statement from the Secretary of the Navy, and invite the careful reading of the same by the membership of the House. We should know the splendid accomplishments of the Navy Department in these matters, especially in view of the fact that there still remain some, like the gentleman from Illinois, who either refuse or fail to inform themselves in reference thereto.

The letter and statement are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, February 13, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. OLIVER: In my letter of the 3d instant to Mr. PADGETT, a copy of which I am sending you herewith, you will find a rather full discussion of the construction at the navy yards within the last three years. This letter is set out in full on page 2584 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date February 3, 1917. I wish you would read it carefully, if you have not already done so. Let me call your attention to the fact that the *Arizona* was constructed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard in 3 years and 10 months from the date of authorization, while her sister ship, the *Pennsylvania*, was built in 3 years and 10 months by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. The *Oklahoma* and *Nevada*, neither of which were mentioned in the letter, were built, respectively, by the New York Shipbuilding Co. and the Fore River Co., the former being accepted on May 2, 1916, the latter on March 11, 1916. Thus the *Oklahoma* was 3 years and 9 months in being built from the date of contract, and the *Nevada* 4 years and 1 month. From date of contract 4 years and 7 months and 4 years and 11 months, respectively, intervened, about 10½ months having elapsed between the date of authorization and the date of contract on both ships.

Except at New York and Mare Island, shipbuilding is a new problem at navy yards, and it can not be expected that the ships first constructed at the yards will show as creditably as ships constructed later, after the organization is working well. The delays in the construction of vessels at the navy yards, as my letter to Mr. PADGETT shows, are largely due to the fact that the yards were not equipped for construction before ships were assigned to them to build, and they could not proceed in the fullest manner until after building ways, and sometimes shops and machinery, had been provided for the work. Thus, while it appears that the *Henderson* and *Bridge* are long overdue, they will be completed within two years of the laying of their keels. But for delays in obtaining forgings from private manufacturers—from lack of which the whole shipbuilding industry has suffered—they would have long since been completed. The same is true of the destroyer *Shaw*, now nearing completion at Mare Island. Although the keel of that vessel was not laid until February 7, 1916, owing to the lack of ways, she will be commissioned within 14 months from the laying thereof.

The last three vessels I have mentioned were all assigned to the navy yards because navy-yard estimates were much below the bids submitted by private shipbuilders, and the indications are that, although the navy yards may in some instances exceed their estimates, the cost of construction will be well under the price we would have had to pay for privately built ships. But now that we have these additional shipbuilding facilities much of the troubles which we experienced and the delays which were encountered in the construction of the first ships built will disappear, and we have, though not to the full extent that I wish we had, facilities to undertake the construction of vessels which private concerns are not in a position to handle. Thus it was possible for me the day after the last appropriation bill was signed to direct the Boston and Philadelphia Navy Yards to proceed at once with the construction of the fuel ship and hospital ship authorized in the bill, whereas after the lapse of considerable time required by advertising for bids on the munition ship only one bid was received, and that in excess of the appropriation. This vessel was thereupon ordered constructed at the Puget Sound yard.

Allow me also to remind you of the difficulties that we have encountered in obtaining the prompt construction of submarines. It was only after months of negotiations and as a result of the department's insistence upon early deliveries that a reduction in time was obtained from the submarine-building companies, and now that the Navy Department is itself constructing engines for submarines it is building at its yards, we may hope for early deliveries on navy-yard-built submarines, and, as a result thereof, a quicker construction from private concerns. I need not recount to you here the difficulties in placing contracts for the scout cruisers and battle cruisers authorized in the last bill; you are undoubtedly familiar with all the circumstances. At this point allow me to call your attention to the following quotation from the first report of the Helm Board, recently printed by your committee, and to its recommendation that judicious improvement of some, if not all, existing navy yards is desirable:

"The commission deems it unnecessary to go into any further detail at present with respect to its conclusions as to abolishing any existing navy yard or naval station. The investment already made at such stations, the possibility of their full and advantageous utilization in caring for the vessels of the fleet, the extreme difficulty of meeting the requirements of the Navy and those merchant vessels which would be taken over by the Navy in time of war and could not be cared for at private shipbuilding plants, the difficulties experienced by our navy yards and private ship-repair and dry-docking establishments at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, leave no doubt in the minds of the members of the commission as to the inadvisability of abolishing at this time or in the near future any existing navy yard within the continental limits of the United States. On the contrary, judicious improvement of some, if not all, existing navy yards is desirable, and the commission can see no just ground for the diminution of the activities of any such existing navy yards or naval stations, having in view the requirements of the fleet, present and prospective, in war as well as in peace."

I append hereto a statement showing the comparative cost of manufacture at a Government plant with the price paid to private concerns for certain munitions required by the department. The economy of Government manufacture is very clearly established, and it will be noted that until the abnormal increase in materials within the last year the cost of manufacture at the Government plants was decreasing. These Government plants have been in operation a number of years, and they have already paid for themselves over and over again, and I confidently expect that with shipbuilding firmly established at the Government navy yards they will prove as successful in economy, efficiency, and rapid production of ships.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Hon. W. B. OLIVER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Powder.

#### COST OF MANUFACTURE AT INDIANHEAD.

	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916
Direct.....	\$0.30511	\$0.29929	\$0.27621	\$0.24912	\$0.321061
Overhead.....	.08025	.08025	.08103	.072243	.096052
Interest (3 per cent on plant).....	.02210	.02210	.02048	.019893	.023609
Total cost.....	.40746	.40164	.38972	.341256	.440782

#### Powder purchased from E. I. du Pont de Nemours.

	Cents.
1912.....	60
1913.....	53 and 60
1914.....	53
1915.....	53
1916.....	50

#### GUNS.

The Naval Gun Factory has built one 16-inch 45-caliber gun, at a cost of \$77,058 for actual labor and material alone. The following table shows the relative costs of manufacture of guns with breech mechanisms:

Caliber.	Naval Gun Factory.	Lowest private bid.
16-inch 45-caliber.....		\$167,295.00
14-inch 50-caliber.....	\$89,560.00	116,000.00
14-inch 45-caliber.....	56,900.00	74,770.00
12-inch 50-caliber.....	56,700.00	72,800.00
12-inch 45-caliber.....	54,400.00	66,912.00
6-inch 50-caliber.....	11,233.00	12,283.00
5-inch 51-caliber.....	5,840.00	9,500.00
4-inch 50-caliber.....		5,772.46

Bids made in 1916 were made upon material for gun forgings that had advanced in price nearly 60 per cent since the forgings for the guns made at the Naval Gun Factory were obtained, and hence it is difficult to make an accurate comparison. The cost of the guns to the Gun Factory does not include any charge for plant or for various overhead items. In order to enable the Midvale and Bethlehem companies to construct 16-inch guns it is necessary for them to install new lathes and machinery for which their estimate is practically the amount estimated as necessary for the Naval Gun Factory, but which amount will not appear in the cost of the guns.

#### TORPEDOES.

The most direct comparison in the case of the torpedoes is that of the Mark VII. The torpedo station cost of this torpedo, ready to fire, is \$5,119.34. That of the Naval Gun Factory, for the first torpedoes manufactured there, is \$7,860.91, and it is expected that this will be reduced to \$5,618.62 on the second order. The cost of this torpedo from the E. W. Bliss Co. was \$6,125.91.

Another close comparison can be made in the cost of Mark IX torpedoes. The cost of this torpedo manufactured by the Bliss Co. under contract dated April, 1914, is \$7,027.86. Its cost made at the torpedo station, ordered in 1914 (as per memorandum of Commander Robison), is \$4,332.30.



## MINES.

The total cost of 1 mine, complete except explosive charge, as manufactured at the Norfolk Navy Yard, is \$321.96.  
Contract with Vickers dated November 7, 1913, for 1,100 mines, complete except explosive charge, fixed the cost at \$498.95 each.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE], which the Clerk will again report.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 5, yeas 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield? How much time will the gentleman want?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Five or maybe ten minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, for some years it has been my custom when the naval bill was under consideration to present information as to the relative cost of manufacturing in Government yards and private yards. I have not done so at this session, because I have been so engrossed in the work of the Committee on Appropriations.

It was ascertained some years ago that the department had so indefensible a system of cost keeping in Government yards that Congress was compelled at times to take radical action in order to have a fairly accurate statement made of the cost of building ships. For instance, at the navy yard in New York it was found that the maintenance cost of the entire plant, regardless of the portion of the overhead that was properly chargeable to construction or repair purposes, was being charged to the ship. I remember I made a statement here at one time upon information furnished me confidentially by one of the paymasters in the Navy, in which I demonstrated conclusively that upon one of the ships over \$1,000,000 had been charged that did not properly belong to the cost of the ship. I do not intend to review those old facts now.

I wish to call the attention of the House to some very late information relative to the cost of Government manufacture as contrasted with private manufacture of munitions of war. Section 121 of the national-defense act provided for the appointment of a board of five citizens, two of whom should be civilians and three officers of the Army, to investigate and report on the feasibility, desirability, and practicability of the Government manufacture of arms, munitions, and equipment, showing in said report the comparative prices of the arms, munitions, and equipment manufactured in Government plants and those manufactured in private plants, and certain other things. That report was transmitted to Congress on the 2d day of January, 1907.

The board consisted of F. J. Kernan, colonel, Twenty-eighth Infantry, president; C. P. Summerall, lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery; Benedict Crowell; R. Goodwin Rhett; and L. M. Fuller, major, United States Army, retired, recorder. Mr. Rhett is president of the National Chamber of Commerce. The following firms were in touch with the board and conferred with them:

The Allis-Chalmers Co.  
The American Radiator Co.  
The American Locomotive Co.  
The Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co.  
The Cincinnati Milling Co.  
The Du Pont Powder Co.  
The General Electric Co.  
The Greenfield Tap & Die Co.  
The Remington Arms Union Metallic Cartridge Co.  
The Winchester Repeating Arms Co.

This is a quotation from the report:

The actual data upon comparative cost is contained in Exhibit F herewith, compiled in the Office of the Chief of Ordnance and covering a period of four years past. An examination of that data discloses that with few exceptions the Government cost is less than the corresponding purchase price. This result should cause no surprise. Indeed, had a contrary state of facts been shown, a grave indictment of the Government plants would have resulted.

This board, absolutely impartial, states that if the Government manufacturing cost were not less than the private plants' selling cost it would constitute a grave indictment against the Government plants.

It says further:

For, considering the question abstractly, it appears at once that the Government cost should be less, and considerably less, as a general rule, than the private manufacturer's price, and this without any imputation upon the efficiency or the business policy of the latter. The Government has no selling expense; it carries no insurance, but merely pays its fire and accident losses at their actual cost, estimated at about three-tenths per cent; its borrowing ability, as related to the cost of its investment, is exercised at a much lower interest rate; it has the advantage of long-continued experience in a few specialized lines, and, finally, it makes no profit.

On page 9 of the report it is stated that it is difficult to say what saving has been made on certain implements and munitions, since they have not been manufactured simultaneously by Government and private plants, but the Chief of Ordnance, Gen. Crozier, has compiled a statement of the saving in such articles as were both manufactured and purchased during the past four years. The board could not definitely determine the saving where the Government was the exclusive manufacturer, but where the Government was manufacturing and purchasing the same article it was able to reach certain conclusions. The exhibit is contained in the report and discloses that certain articles, costing \$9,397,737.40 out of a total of \$35,106,523.09 manufactured by the Government at its arsenals in four years, were compared with the cost of obtaining them by contracts; that is, about 25 per cent of the Government manufacturing was compared in this total. The report shows that the same articles if bought at prices paid for similar articles would have cost the Government \$11,153,593.42. The saving to the Government, therefore, on \$9,397,000 of manufactured products was \$1,755,856.02. Practically 10 per cent is saved over what it would cost if we obtained the articles by contract.

There is no essential difference between the conduct of an establishment that manufactures large guns, rifles, ammunition, and munitions over an establishment that constructs war vessels or other industrial establishments.

In the years that I have been assigned to the duty of ascertaining the cost of Government manufacture and private manufacture at Government arsenals it has been established conclusively that the Government arsenals are manufacturing more cheaply than the Government can purchase the same articles from private manufacturers.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] never was friendly to navy-yard construction. He never tried to find out just what the cost was. While he was chairman of the committee we had a continual controversy to take the Government out of the control and the grip of the private contractors and to have it utilize its own establishments for the doing of essential work for the defense of the country.

We demonstrated by repeated illustrations that the navy yards did, in competition on single items, do the work more cheaply than it could be done by contract. We established it by investigations of the arsenals conducted by the War Department rather than by the Navy Department. I have not the slightest doubt but that if the committee had been headed by a man who wanted to get the facts he would have demonstrated that the Government yards were equally economical in the construction of Government ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman that the time has all been allotted.

Mr. MANN. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the personal attack, the unwarranted attack, on my colleague, he is entitled to reply.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask, Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement by the gentleman from Illinois that his colleague [Mr. FOSS] be given five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to Government construction of ships if it can be shown that there is a combination on the part of private shipbuilders to hold the Government up. It has never been shown. If it can be further shown that the Government can build ships cheaper than they can be built by private contractors—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. It is shown absolutely that there has never been a case of Government construction of large ships, colliers or battleships, where it did not cost a great deal more to build them in Government yards than by private concerns.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New York?



Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman says it has never been shown that there is an understanding between private yards, or there is now?

Mr. FOSS. It has never been shown that there has been an understanding.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has been shown that all the private yards submitted identical bids for the same ships. If that was not the result of an understanding it is a remarkable coincidence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. No; I can not yield. I have only five minutes.

Now, the trouble is that the cost-counting system in private shipbuilding concerns is one thing and in Government yards it is another thing. The Government navy yards exclude a great many things that are in the cost-counting system in private shipbuilding concerns.

Now, I am going to read a little statement that has been approved by a man in our Navy Department who knows what he is talking about on this subject of cost in Government navy yards, because he has to do directly with it. He says:

The cost of work done in navy yards does not include all the elements that enter into the cost of the work. It includes the cost of direct labor and material but does not include all the indirect or overhead charges. The new accounting instructions which were put in effect July 1, 1915, provided that certain fixed charges shall be made against the military maintenance of the yard, and this has the effect of making the cost of work appear much less than it formerly was or than it really is.

The building of a new ship in a navy yard also results in transferring to the appropriation under which she is built a certain portion of the cost of the work. In round numbers, from 25 to 28 per cent of the indirect cost is charged directly against the appropriation concerned. To make this plain, it may be stated that in the building of a ship such as the *Arizona* at the New York Navy Yard only about 70 or 75 per cent of the indirect charges are charged to the cost of that ship, the remainder being charged directly against the appropriation "Increase of the Navy." Items of cost which are not charged against the cost of work are the pay of draftsmen, of clerks, of people engaged in inspection work, bookkeepers, storekeepers, and messengers. The pay of officers concerned in the supervision of the work is not charged. Certain repairs made to the rolling stock in navy yards and the car tracks, vehicles, etc., is charged to another account than that of cost of work.

One of the big items of expense in navy yards is the annual leave of 30 days granted to employees, to say nothing about the holidays. This amounts to about 14 or 15 per cent of the cost of labor, but is charged directly to the appropriation and not against the cost of work. Similarly, disability pay is not charged in fixing the cost of work.

That is found in another item of the naval appropriation bill, or some other bill, I believe, but it is not charged against the cost of the work. I read further:

In building ships by contract the shipbuilder has to include all of the foregoing items in his cost, and, besides that, he has to charge for the investment in his plant represented by the cost of land and buildings and equipment. He has also to charge for the interest on his working capital. He has to pay insurance on his plant and on the ships while they are under construction. He has to charge for depreciation of his buildings and equipment. No such charges are made against the cost of construction in navy yards, and every Naval appropriation bill carries with it a liberal appropriation for the replacement of tools. The shipbuilder has also to pay taxes on his plant, and now also on the profits of his plant. This all tends to swell the cost of production and to make the contract-built ship cost more than one built in navy yards. Unfortunately, as pointed out by Mr. Ferguson, president of the Newport News Co., on pages 1107 and 1108 of his hearing before the House Committee on Naval Affairs (which may be found in pamphlet No. 20, entitled "Cost of preparedness"), it is impossible to get the true cost of work done in navy yards, and the shipbuilder is up against the proposition of matching his actual cost, which he can determine to a nicety, against the fictitious cost reported from navy yards.

Before the passage of the eight-hour law the bids of shipbuilders for the construction of ships was very much lower than the cost in navy yards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman want more time?

Mr. FOSS. I would like to have two or three minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FOSS. I read further:

Since the passage of the eight-hour law, however, prices from shipyards have materially risen, until now the difference in reported cost of construction at navy yards does not differ greatly from the bids submitted by shipbuilders. If all the items of cost that should appear were included in the cost returns from navy yards, there can be no question of the fact that the cost in navy yards would be much greater than for construction by contract.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Who wrote that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman says we do not charge against the ship the draftsmen who prepare the plans when the ships are built in the navy yards. Do we not furnish the plans to private shipbuilders free, and that is not added to the cost of the private-built ships, although the Government bears all the expense of preparing those plans? We prepare the plans.

Mr. FOSS. The private shipbuilding concerns employ a great many draftsmen and clerks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We prepare the plans and furnish them to the builders to work upon.

Mr. FOSS. That is true in every business. Whenever the Government contracts for a certain piece of work it is necessary to prepare the plans and specifications upon which the different concerns can bid. That is so in every line of business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired. All time is expired. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

If, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, the most rapid and economical construction of the battle cruiser herein appropriated for can be obtained thereby, he may contract for the construction of said battle cruiser upon the basis of actual cost, plus a reasonable profit to be determined by him.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN: On page 60, after line 23, insert: "It is hereby reaffirmed to be the policy of the United States to adjust and settle its international disputes through mediation or arbitration, to the end that war may be honorably avoided."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of each of the sums appropriated by this act, except such amounts as may be required to meet obligations authorized in previous acts and for which contracts have been made, no part shall be used to procure through purchase or contract any vessels, armament, articles, or materials which the navy yards, gun factories, or other industrial plants operated by the Navy Department are equipped to supply, unless such Government plants are operated approximately at their full capacity for not less than one regular shift each working day, except when contract costs are less than costs in said Government plants, and except when said Government plants are unable to complete the work within the time required, and except in cases of emergency: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in regard to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] was talking about a moment ago, I am reminded of an incident that happened about one year ago in the presence of a young gentleman who was a member of the mechanical engineering class at Ann Arbor. He, with his class, went out on a tour of inspection. The class stopped at Pittsburgh, at the Westinghouse plant, and there he saw them make casings for 3-inch shells. He came direct from there to Washington and went down to the navy yard, and they were making casing for a 3-inch shell, identically the same kind as he saw them making in Pittsburgh. He timed with a watch the making of the articles at each plant. While the workman made 15 casings in the Westinghouse plant in Pittsburgh in a given time, during the same length of time the workman at the navy yard made 1.

Now, think of that! That was on account of the increased efficiency of the man and the increased efficiency of the machinery and its operation.

But that is not all. A gentleman of this House told me about a year ago that he was down at the navy yard and was introduced to an employee from his own State who looked like a very old man, and he asked him how long he had been there. Said he, "I have been here since the year 1844, excepting four years that I was in the Army." "Why," he was asked, "my friend, how old are you?" "Why, I am only 92 years old." Is it any wonder that it takes them as long to make one article in the navy yard as it does to make 15 at the Westinghouse plant? [Laughter.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, of course the Members of the House are always glad of an opportunity to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER] amuse us; but the unfortunate part of this proceeding is that when citizens of the



country read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they are very likely to take the gentleman's statement seriously.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. It is serious, and it is true. It was the son of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] here who saw it.

Mr. KEATING. I have no doubt in the world that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER] takes it seriously, but I do not think there is another human being who is familiar with the facts who takes it seriously. Now, the truth is that you can not manufacture 15 shells in the Westinghouse concern, or any place else, while you are manufacturing one in the navy yard.

Mr. FORDNEY. The fact is that they do.

Mr. KEATING. If that were true, if you could turn out fifteen times as much in a private establishment as they do in a Government establishment, I submit, even to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that that result would be shown when these private establishments are bidding for Government contracts.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. KEATING. I will.

Mr. PADGETT. The Government does not, in any navy yard, or elsewhere, pretend or attempt to make large shells. It has made a few experimental small shells, the largest I believe 8 inches. It is true, I presume, that they make at Pittsburgh many times more than 15 to 1 of the big shells, because the Government does not make any big shells at all.

Mr. KEATING. The fact is, as all the Members of this House who have gone into the matter know—

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Let me answer.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman will restrain himself just a moment—all the investigations that have been made have demonstrated that Government manufacture is cheaper than private manufacture. We had read here this morning by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] a statement prepared by a board which was not friendly to Government manufacture, and the finding of that board was to the effect that the saving was at least 10 per cent, in fact, much more. I make this statement merely that some answer may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that it shall not go out to the country that this House, merely because it laughed at what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER] said, indorsed what he said. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I made to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER] the statement that he repeated to the House. I visited the navy yard and saw them make 3-inch casings. I know the statement made by Mr. MILLER is correct; it does not make any difference what others say. I made a statement on the floor of this House once before, and I am going to make it again now for the information of the gentlemen here: Through the courtesy of this House I secured an appropriation for the construction of a building in the congressional district in Michigan that I have the honor to represent here. That building cost, in round numbers, fifty-nine thousand and some odd hundreds of dollars, of which about \$8,900 was spent for superintendence and plans for the construction of that building.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does the gentleman mean to have us understand that he vouches for the man being 92 years old also?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I did not see that gentleman, but I saw the casings being made. Down here in the navy yard—I presume the same method is yet used—the method of making these shells is that when the workman puts his foot upon the pedal of a machine a rod comes down, presses the plate into the die, and makes the shell or casings. He takes it leisurely out by hand and lays it aside, picks up another plate and lays it on the die, puts his foot on the lever, and then the casing is made; whereas at Pittsburgh the machine works automatically, and the plates go through rapidly and come out in the form of casings.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Michigan calls the outside the shell. The Committee on Naval Affairs call the inside the shell.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I said shells, and I saw them made in the Westinghouse plant at the rate of 15 for every 1 made in the navy yard.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. That is the main thing—15 to 1. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Not 16 to 1, but 15 to 1, and that is about as near as the Government can come in doing anything practical, as compared with a private concern or an individual. [Applause.]

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] stated that it had never been shown that there was any absence of honest competition between shipbuilders, and so forth. During the Fifty-third Congress Charles M. Schwab, the present head of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, which owns shipbuilding yards, was testifying before a committee of Congress, and was asked this question:

Senator BLACKBURN. Is there any competition in the price of armor in this country as between yourselves and the Bethlehem Co.—

At that time Mr. Schwab was general manager of the Carnegie Steel Co.

Mr. SCHWAB. No, sir; assuredly not. We have always had an understanding in that matter. We—

Carnegie—

never take a contract that we do not consult with the Bethlehem about it.

Senator BLACKBURN. I asked if there is competition.

Mr. SCHWAB. No, sir; there is no competition. I want to be quite fair on that point.

Now, as to the difference in cost between the manufacture of things in arsenals and private plants, I desire to read a little further from the same document that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] quoted from a few moments ago. (S. Doc. No. 664, 64th Cong., 2d sess., p. 26.) This document shows that in the manufacture of field-artillery carriages, caissons, and limbers we are manufacturing these articles in Government plants 43 per cent cheaper than we can get them from private manufacturers.

As to cannon powder, we are manufacturing it 42 per cent cheaper; 12-inch projectiles weighing 700 pounds, 80 per cent cheaper; 12-inch projectiles weighing 600 pounds, 67 per cent cheaper; optical instruments, 9 per cent cheaper. These figures were compiled by a board that I consider unfair to the Government-manufacture side. All the testimony that was presented was by the private firms that manufacture these munitions and the Army officers who are opposed to complete Government manufacture. Nevertheless, the report proves the economy of Government manufacture of munitions.

The War Department in 1913 purchased 7,000 4.7-inch shrapnel from the ammunition ring, paying \$25.26 each therefor. At the same time precisely the same article was being manufactured in a Government plant at a cost of \$15.45. The War Department paid the ring \$17.50 for a 3.8-inch common shrapnel, when it can manufacture the identical article for \$7.94. The Government has manufactured at the Rock Island Arsenal caissons for gun carriages at a cost of \$1,128.67 for which private manufacturers had been paid \$1,744.10, which is 54.6 per cent greater than the arsenal cost. Take powder. The Government has purchased \$25,000,000 worth of powder from the Powder Trust since 1905, paying therefor all the way from 53 cents to 80 cents per pound. We are manufacturing powder in Government plants for 34 cents per pound, and the officers in charge state that the more we manufacture the cheaper we can produce it. A hundred similar illustrations could be cited if time permitted.

Whenever there is a discussion of the subject of Government manufacture of munitions of war a peculiar thing develops. We find that those Members of Congress who are the leaders for excessive preparedness are also the most bitter enemies of Government manufacture. Why is this? Let them answer.

I have always contended that the test of sincerity in the demand for great preparedness is whether those who advocate it are willing that the people shall receive the preparedness which they advocate without private profit to the J. P. Morgan controlled war trust.

If those who are crying up to Heaven for greatly increased appropriations for preparation for war are wholly sincere, you would think they themselves would demand Government manufacture in order that the Nation might obtain a dollar's worth of preparedness for every dollar appropriated, instead of only 50 or 60 or 70 cents' worth.

But whenever you show me a man who is professionally agitating big Army and Navy appropriations I will attempt to show you a man opposed to Government manufacture of the preparedness he is demanding.

The Navy League of the United States, which I have on several occasions shown to have been founded and supported by war-trafficking firms, went to great trouble and expense to defeat me for reelection because I have advocated the elimination of private profit from war and preparation for war by the manufacture of Army and Navy supplies in Government arsenals and navy yards. In other words, the Navy League insists that because I advocate Government manufacture I am opposed to preparedness. The Navy League's position is that



everyone who would interfere with the profits of those munitions and armor makers who are set forth in the Navy League Journal as the founders of the Navy League is an enemy of preparedness.

In this connection I wish to state that those who allege that we are not prepared as we ought to be at this time can not lay the blame at the doors of those who have been consistently advocating in Congress the Government manufacture of Army and Navy supplies. If we are not adequately prepared, it is not because the American people have not paid in taxes the price of adequate preparedness, but because too many millions of dollars of the money appropriated for preparedness have gone into the pockets of J. P. Morgan, Charles M. Schwab, and other munitions makers in the form of excessive profits instead of into preparedness. Three firms have drawn down contracts aggregating more than \$200,000,000 from the Army and Navy Departments, and Army and Navy officers have generously paid these firms from 20 to 60 per cent more for practically every dollar's worth of these supplies than they could have been manufactured for in Government establishments.

It has been charged that the public buildings and the rivers and harbors bills are pork-barrel bills. I believe they are to a large extent. I voted against them. But the percentage of pork in those bills is but a drop in the bucket as compared to the Army and Navy appropriation bills.

I am going to vote against these so-called preparedness bills solely because they are loaded to the guards with fat, juicy pork for the private munitions manufacturers. If enough Members would vote against these bills, as myself and others are doing, it would not mean that we would not get any preparedness at this session but that the committees in charge would be forced to bring in bills making provision for Government manufacture of supplies. It would also mean that the Nation would get from one-fourth to one-third more preparedness for the same money that we are now appropriating. But, in the opinion of the Navy League and professional preparedness advocates, it is quite unpatriotic to demand that the Nation shall receive the maximum defensive power or the maximum striking power for the sums appropriated.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does not the testimony show that not only do the munitions makers refuse to compete with each other but that they have had similar arrangements with European munitions manufacturers?

Mr. TAVENNER. The records of the Supreme Court show that for a period of about 10 years the Du Pont Powder Co. was in a contract with European powder manufacturers by which it was agreed that if the United States Government should attempt to escape the net of the Du Pont concern, which had a monopoly of the sale of smokeless powder to the Government, and should ask for a bid from the European powder makers, the latter were bound by the terms of the contract first to write to the Du Ponts and ascertain what prices the Du Ponts had quoted to the American Government, and then not to quote any lower price. The same arrangement existed as regards any attempt of the European Governments to escape the strangle holds of the European powder firms by attempting to buy powder in America.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons it is thought wise for the Government to enter the field of manufacture at all is to determine the cost of manufacture of various articles needed by the Government. Unless we do accurately determine the cost of manufacture in plants operated by the Government it is not going to help us very much in ascertaining what is a fair price to be charged by private manufacturers. I think, from what investigation I have been able to make since I have been a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that there is some basis for the belief that the Government does not know accurately what it costs to manufacture articles made in Government plants. I think we ought, beyond all doubt, to clear up this matter of cost in Government manufacture. The Government should install a system of cost accounting which will accurately convey to Congress and to the people of the country the exact cost of production, and then we will know what we are doing and whether we are making money or losing money by doing the work ourselves.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. We have just made an appropriation, altogether, of \$18,000,000 to fix up certain navy yards. A part of that—probably the major part of it—is to equip navy yards for the construction of capital ships. How can anybody tell what proportion of that equipment is to be charged to any one ship?

Mr. KELLEY. I will say to the gentleman that the present chief accountant of the Navy Department—Admiral McGowan—has just completed a survey of all the navy yards of the Government. He has made charts showing the layout of every shop in the various navy yards. He has undertaken to assign the amount of depreciation of every machine in every one of these shops to a given piece of work. From a calculation of the use of shops and machinery in the production of any given work the total overhead charge as compared with the cost of labor or material has been thoroughly worked out by the department. This system follows closely upon systems now in use in private plants generally in the country.

Now, I will say further to the gentleman from Illinois that the Secretary of the Navy has not yet put this new system into operation, and if by the time we make the next bill it has not been put in operation I shall do all I can to have the matter taken care of by appropriate legislation.

Mr. MANN. Very well. Suppose you equip a navy yard with a \$6,000,000 equipment for the construction of capital ships and you then build one capital ship that will cost \$15,000,000 and you never build any more; the whole thing is charged against that one ship. How does anybody know how many more ships will be constructed at the same navy yard? The Lord can not tell what Congress is going to do, nor anybody else.

Mr. KELLEY. That would be more or less true of private construction as well; but the Government ought to be able to say with as much certainty as a private corporation what elements ought to go into the overhead charges. It has been ascertained in this system of accounting which Admiral McGowan has worked out that the proper overhead to be included as an overhead charge against any ship is about 65 per cent of the labor cost entering into the ship. This of course has nothing to do with profit.

Under a system like that the proper overhead can readily be ascertained and can be added to the cost of labor, which is definite, and the cost of material, which is definite, and then you can get the accurate cost to the Government of the ship.

Mr. GARLAND. But how can the Government, in the gentleman's estimation, secure this information when every bill practically that is passed here carries a provision that time shall not be taken into consideration. The stop-watch clause, as it is referred to, precludes the possibility of what the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. KELLEY. There ought not to be any trouble at all about the Government being able to determine cost, any more than a private manufacturer. And until we do put some system into effect which will do this we will have no proper check upon cost of work done for the Government under private contract.

The Government undertakes to supervise the corporations of the country. We have a Federal Trade Commission, and that commission has recommended a uniform system of accounting to be adopted generally in order to determine accurate costs of manufacture throughout the country, and if the Government can work out such a system as that for private corporations, it does seem to me that we ought to be able to do it for the Government itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan have one minute more in order that I may be able to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know whether or not this cost-accounting system of which he speaks has been used in an effort to ascertain what the real cost of these great cruisers may be; and if so, how nearly it comes to the estimate placed upon the cost by the private builder himself?

Mr. KELLEY. In reply to my colleague I will say that it is my understanding that the estimate of the Government of the value of material and the value of the labor entering into these cruisers and the proper amount of overhead charges, which should be added to the cost of labor and material, making the full cost of the ship, is almost identical with the amount estimated for material, labor, and overhead charges by private concerns bidding for these ships.

Mr. PADGETT. There was some difference in overhead charges. They grouped profit and overhead charges together, the gentleman will remember.

Mr. VARE rose.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?



Mr. VARE. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. VARE. Five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Will not the gentleman take that on the next paragraph?

Mr. GARLAND. Certainly, if I can speak upon this same subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion concerning the relative difference in efficiency between the private shipyards and the Government shipyards. I am extremely sorry that my friend from Illinois [Mr. Foss] is not present, for I would be able to call to his attention an instance which he possibly has overlooked in the construction of a transport quite recently. A discussion was had upon the floor of

the House relative to the bids received for the transport *Henderson*, recently launched at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. At the time of opening bids for this ship there were five bids received by the Government from private yards, as follows:

[Bids opened Dec. 20, 1913.]

Transport "No. 1."

Bidder.	Class.	Time.	Speed.	Price.
		Months.	Knots.	
New York Shipbuilding Co.....	1	24	14	\$1,752,000
Fore River Shipbuilding Co.....	1	24	14	1,804,000
Seattle Construction & Dry Dock Co.....	1	24	14	1,931,100
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.....	1	24	14	1,725,000
The Wm. Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co.....	1	24	14	1,825,400

<sup>1</sup>If tried at Lewes, Del.

The lowest bid was from the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., and their price, as above stated, was \$1,725,000. The Secretary of the Navy was not satisfied as to the reasonableness of that bid and he invited the Government navy yards to compete and also submit bids for the construction of the ship as follows:

Transport "No. 1."

Item and division.	Navy yards.					
	Mare Island.	New York.	Norfolk.	Portsmouth.	Puget Sound.	Philadelphia.
<b>Labor:</b>						
Hull.....	\$448,830	\$744,258	\$543,800	\$587,131	\$493,896	\$379,094.00
Machinery.....	155,228	162,594	187,015	184,640	184,281	150,235.18
<b>Material:</b>						
Hull.....	427,931	453,547	380,250	449,326	390,693	419,682.00
Machinery.....	259,039	241,205	261,700	329,206	218,893	216,164.01
<b>Indirect:</b>						
Hull.....	190,492	242,748	212,130	162,945	219,202	135,862.00
Machinery.....	70,335	50,318	76,137	63,180	81,826	48,532.77
<b>Total:</b>						
Hull.....	1,067,253	1,440,553	1,136,180	1,199,402	1,103,791	924,638.00
Machinery.....	484,622	454,177	524,852	577,026	485,000	414,931.99
Total (yard estimate).....	1,551,875	1,894,730	1,661,032	1,776,428	1,588,791	1,349,569.99
<b>Yard estimates for drafting:</b>						
Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	None.	None.	51,000	128,900	14,000	43,000.00
Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	None.	None.	None.	15,000	15,000	12,500.00
Total estimate.....	None.	None.	51,000	143,900	29,000	55,500.00

<sup>1</sup>Not included in total estimates submitted by yard.

<sup>2</sup>Includes also reporting weights, mold loft work, and inclining experiments.

It was said at the time by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] that on the one hand was a legitimate bid, backed up by bond from Newport News Shipbuilding Co., and on the other side a mere guess by irresponsible navy-yard employees. I said on the floor of this House that if it were possible as a business proposition I would be willing to give my personal bond as a guaranty that the employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard would be able to carry out their estimate and finish the ship in accordance with their proposition. Of course, that was not a practical thing to do, but, however, there was a promise on their part to save \$320,000 upon the construction of the ship. I want this House to know that that ship has been launched and is practically completed, and that instead of saving \$320,000 to the Government they have saved more than \$400,000. [Applause.]

I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that in making the calculations there was a liberal allowance for insurance, a liberal allowance for additional electric lighting, and an additional allowance estimated for compensation so that there were full and adequate overhead charges when the final estimate was made. I am not in favor as a general proposition of Government ownership, but I am in favor of this Government being in a position not only to give assistance to a great policy of naval preparedness, but I believe in the equipment of these navy yards as a good business investment for the Government in order that it may at all times be able to ascertain what is a reasonable, fair, and proper charge for the construction of these ships; and I am quite sure that if the Secretary of the Navy in his wisdom directs the building of any of these large ships at the navy yard in the city of Philadelphia that the officials and employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard will not only make good in the future but they will verify the splendid record they have made in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I represent a navy-yard district. I am not one of those who claim that all naval ships should be constructed in navy yards, but I do say that at least half of the battleships, destroyers, colliers, submarines, and the

other ships of the Navy should be constructed in navy yards when the navy-yard estimates are as low or lower than the private yard bids. Even though the yards do not construct a single ship, if they are equipped to build ships and are in a position to bid, it saves the Government money, because the private yards then, on account of competition with Government yards, have to build for a reasonable profit and will be compelled to construct the ships within a reasonable time. Since the navy yards have been permitted to estimate upon these ships the private yards have been bidding at a more reasonable price, and they have been constructing the ships in quicker time.

Invidious comparisons have been made between the construction in private yards and navy yards to the detriment of the navy yards. I have some figures here that show the navy yards, and particularly the Mare Island Navy Yard, have saved the United States Government a great deal of money. The following figures are on construction awarded to the Mare Island Navy Yard during the past five years. In every instance the estimate of the yard was lower than the private bid, the Mare Island Yard in every instance being lower. First, take the bid on the collier *Jupiter*. The Mare Island estimate was \$1,130,000. That was lower than any private bid submitted. Mare Island constructed that ship for \$980,000, or \$150,000 under the estimate. The river gunboats *Monocacy* and *Palos* were estimated for at \$278,000, and the actual cost of construction was \$239,600, a saving of \$38,400. The fuel ship *Kanawha*, estimate of cost \$1,120,000, actual cost \$944,000, a saving of \$176,000. The fuel ship *Maumee*, estimate \$707,000, cost \$617,000, saving \$90,000. The oil barges No. 8 and No. 9, estimate of cost \$148,000, cost \$128,000, saving \$20,000. Two coal barges, estimate \$240,000, cost \$226,000, a saving of \$14,000 under the estimate. The total of all estimates was \$3,623,000, the total cost was \$3,134,600, a total saving under the estimate of \$488,400.

Mr. GARLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURRY. In a moment. To this saving to the Government should be added the difference between the lowest bid by



a private yard and the estimate on which the award was made to the Mare Island Navy Yard, which would increase the saving to the Government over a million dollars more.

Mr. GARLAND. How are the estimates ascertained—by contract, by bids on the proposition, or by some individual just estimating—and who is he who estimates?

Mr. CURRY. The estimate is made under the direction of the commandant of the yard, Capt. Bennett, and Naval Constructor Gleason, and the evidence that the estimates were correct is that the ships are built, are sailing the ocean, and the money that was saved is in the Treasury of the United States, and Mare Island has not come to Congress for a deficiency. [Applause.] I have not at hand the exact saving to the Government on the construction of the *Shaw* and other new work built at the yard last year, but I know it amounted to more than \$200,000 under the estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, may I have my time extended a minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been limited, the Chair will say to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CURRY. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that the *California* was awarded to Mare Island on an estimate of \$7,100,000, and the lowest bid from a private yard was \$7,700,000, and I am assured by Capt. Bennett and Constructor Gleason that the *California* will be constructed within the time limit and estimate of cost.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in order to offset the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] as to the cost of work by the Government, I am going to ask to insert in the Record letters which were sent to this House last year by the Secretary of the Treasury, and also by Brig. Gen. William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, and I will now ask unanimous consent to insert those letters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, when I presented the amendment asking for equipment of the navy yard at Boston I expected I would hear a voice from the Republican side of the aisle expressing the sentiment of the people of Boston and to assist me in getting an appropriation for the Boston Navy Yard. Since this bill has been before the House I have been constantly in attendance trying to do my utmost in perfecting the bill and every few days the editorial writers of the papers in my city in their news columns printed editorials upholding the good work of my distinguished Republican colleague from Boston [Mr. TINKHAM] in that he had taken to task the Secretary of the Navy because he had not equipped the Boston Navy Yard and that nothing was being done there to help the department. But to-day as in other days his voice is silent and we have not heard him express himself.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. In fairness to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] to whom the gentleman has referred and criticized because he has not raised his voice in justification of the enlargement of the Boston yard, is it not fair to say that he is now engaged in some very important work before the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the gentleman, let me say the navy yard is situated in the district I have the honor to represent.

Mr. LOBECK. If the gentleman will permit, I desire to say the District Committee adjourned at 11.30.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, it is now 2.30 p. m. I am only criticizing my distinguished colleague in a friendly manner because of the fact that certain newspapers have criticized the Democratic administration which has been giving so much work to our yard, and have played up in headlines that he was going to have a battleship built there and how he criticized the Secretary of the Navy because he had not done anything to equip that yard. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, the navy yard at Boston was never in such a good condition as it is to-day.

Since Secretary Daniels has become Secretary of the Navy he has been very fair with the Boston Navy Yard. He has added to the improvement year by year, and has shown a very friendly disposition for further improvement. It is his intention to keep the yard constantly employed by the building of ships of the 12,000 to 15,000 ton size, thereby giving constant employment to the men in every branch. Naturally the people of our district want to see the yard equipped in such a manner

that they can build the larger type of ship, and I am one of those who has worked constantly for the necessary improvements made to bring about this work. No yard has improved more rapidly than ours and it is unfair to say that we have suffered at the expense of any other yard in the country.

As I said in remarks I made a few minutes ago we have every equipment available excepting the enlarged ways, the necessary new machinery, and a few new cranes for the building of battleships, and that was my contention, and is now, that one should be built there. We have 3,300 men employed there to-day working in the yard, as against 1,900 four years ago.

We have recently built and launched the supply ship *Bridge*, which is the first ship built at the Boston Navy Yard in more than 50 years. She is now almost completed and will be in commission in a very short while. She is the sister ship to the ship referred to by the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. VARE].

When the bids were made for the building of this ship the Boston Navy Yard was the lowest bidder by more than \$100,000, and it was a question as to whether or not they could complete the ship within the specified cost. Not only has this been done, but I am assured by the Navy Department that she will be completed within the cost and within the time specified in the contract. The keel for this ship was laid in June, 1915, and she is now practically completed with the exception of a few slight finishing touches and will be in commission within a month. I believe this bears out our contention that ships can be built in our navy yards as well and as cheaply as they can in private yards.

Since I have been a Member of Congress I have devoted a great deal of my time and attention in procuring work for men and equipment for making our navy yard one of the best in the country. I think it is only fair to say at this time that in my endeavors I have had the assistance of Hon. Josephus Daniels, present Secretary of the Navy, who has shown a splendid disposition to do all in his power to bring our yard up to a high class of efficiency. He has assured me that it is his intention to keep the yard going as rapidly as possible in the building of ships of a lighter size than battleships. For 16 years previous to his administration we have had Massachusetts men serving as Secretaries of the Navy. We have had Hon. William H. Moody, the late Hon. John D. Long, and Hon. George von L. Meyer. Not any of these men have during their time shown any great disposition to build up the yard, but, on the contrary, Mr. Meyer recommended that the yard be closed and abolished. I believe that it was a disgrace to our Government that these men, coming from Boston, left the yard in such a deplorable condition, and it is extremely amusing to hear at this time my Republican friends, now out of power, criticizing an administration which is doing so much to improve a navy yard which they practically reduced to a scrap heap during 16 years of Republican rule and which they could, if they had had the interest of the people at heart, have made it one of the leading yards of the country. When I came to Congress two years ago there were only 1,900 men employed at the navy yard, while to-day there are 3,500 employed there, and, with the additional work now being sent there, it will mean the employment of many more men. The men are receiving better wages than ever before, and a splendid force of workmen is now employed. During the past year more men were employed, more work was turned out from the shops, and more repair work done on ships than ever before in the history of the navy yard. The rope walk has increased its output by more than 100 per cent, and we are manufacturing the largest and best rope that can be procured. Our blacksmith shops are turning out the largest chains ever made for the Government and have improved their output by more than 400 per cent. All of the other departments have improved in the same manner, and at one time we had 42 ships undergoing repairs. During the past year, together with the minor repairs on the ships above mentioned, we have completely overhauled several of the larger ships, such as the *Georgia*, which was repaired at a cost exceeding \$600,000, and the *Virginia*, with repairs amounting to more than \$550,000. We have also built several torpedo-testing barges, costing \$125,000 each, and at the present time are ready to lay the keel of a new hospital ship which is to cost \$1,500,000. I call these matters to the attention of the House for the purpose of showing that we are ready to engage in any class of work in the building of ships for the Navy, and I am certain that, with the force of men now employed at our yard, they could show to the people of the country that the proper place for the building of the ships for the Navy is in the navy yards now owned by the Government.



The letters are as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1915.

HON. LINDLEY M. GARRISON,  
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been turning over in my mind the possibility of saying something on the floor of the House of Representatives in relation to munitions and other supplies manufactured by Government plants.

Will you please be good enough to send me at your earliest convenience such printed data as you may have on the subject with reference to the various arsenals and other plants under the jurisdiction of the War Department, and particularly will you please furnish me with the following information:

First. In preparing cost data do the various plants carry as an overhead charge the interest upon the money invested in them; and if so, at what rate of interest?

Second. Is depreciation in value of buildings, machinery, and tools taken into consideration; and if so, what percentage in the various articles?

Third. Do the various plants carry as an overhead charge any amount for supervision from the office of the Secretary of War or the bureau under whose immediate jurisdiction they are working?

Fourth. Are any of the salaries of the officers who have supervision or direction or any kind of control of the work in the plants omitted from the cost data; and if so, to what extent?

Fifth. In purchasing materials do the plants pay more or less than is paid by private concerns; and if so, why?

Sixth. Do the employees engaged in work in the various plants receive the highest, the average, or a lower rate of pay than that given by private concerns in the same line of business? What comparison would you make as to hours of labor of the men and pay of supervisory force?

Seventh. Is the product produced by the plants superior, equal to, or inferior to the product obtained from private enterprise?

Eighth. What comparison with private enterprise can you make as to the time required to produce a unit?

Ninth. Do the plants carry in their cost data interest on expenditures from the time of the first outlay until the job is completed?

Tenth. Does the cost data include the expenses of repairs and replacement of tools and machinery and repairs to buildings?

Eleventh. What has been the increased value of plant, real estate, etc., per annum since its original purchase?

If there are no figures available to answer these questions specifically, will you please furnish me, if you can, a general statement which will approximate as accurately as possible?

Assuring you of my belief in the efficiency of Government work in Government shops and my sincere appreciation of any courtesies extended to me, I am,

Yours, sincerely,

M. O.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,  
Washington, December 23, 1915.

HON. CHARLES POPE CALDWELL,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: 1. Your communication of the 20th instant, addressed to the Secretary of War (0.0000.71/96), has been referred to this office for reply. No printed matter relative to the method of arriving at costs used by this department is available, but a typewritten memorandum on this subject, prepared some time ago, is inclosed. Replies to part of your question are covered by this memorandum. The answers to your questions will be numbered to correspond to the questions.

First. Yes; 3 per cent on money invested.

Second. Yes; buildings from 2 to 8 per cent, depending upon whether frame, brick, concrete, or stone; machinery, 4 to 10 per cent, depending upon size and use; allowance for depreciation.

Third. Yes; reference to page 2 of the memorandum herewith will show the items which are considered in determining the War Department overhead and the percentage of the total cost of these items that is considered in arriving at this charge. It will be noted that it amounts to 3.59 per cent.

Fourth. No; 80 per cent of the total pay of the officers so employed is included in arriving at total cost.

Fifth. It is difficult to say, but it is believed that the Government, as a rule, gets slightly lower prices.

Sixth. Instructions as to wages to be paid require that the same wages shall be paid as is paid for the same or similar work in the vicinity. The same rule also applies to the civilian supervisory force. The hours of labor in private plants are, as a rule, 9 or 10, as compared with 8 hours in the Government shops. Many private plants, however, give a half holiday throughout the year on Saturday, but it is without pay, whereas a half holiday with pay is given in the Government service from June 15 to September 15. Leaves, holidays, and half holidays now granted amount to 28½ days per year, without pay.

Seventh. The inspection of material produced in private plants, as a rule, insures the product being equal to that produced in Government plants, although in some cases the product has been slightly inferior to that produced by the Government.

Eighth. No advantage can be claimed as to the time required in producing material in the Government plants, as compared with private plants.

Ninth. In only one case has the Government taken into consideration interest on the material involved from the first outlay until the job is completed. This is in connection with the manufacture of smokeless powder at Picatinny Arsenal.

Tenth. Yes; cost includes repair and replacement.

Eleventh. This is difficult to answer. The land occupied by the various arsenals was purchased many years ago, some as early as 1795, and has had the same appreciation that land has had generally in the vicinity.

Referring to the memorandum herewith, it should be noted that the appropriation cost is that usually referred to and given in price lists and is the price used in connection with all transactions with the Army and in certain other special cases. To this price is added the general arsenal burden and War Department burden in making certain other sales; also when comparing arsenal cost with that of private manufacturers. In paragraph 2 on the first page of the memorandum will be found a number of arsenal burden factors. The

average for all arsenals is approximately 14.4, which, added to the War Department burden given on the second page, makes the average overhead 18, which is the percentage charged in addition to the appropriation cost, as stated in certain cases.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM CROZIER,  
Brig. Gen., Chief of Ordnance

Memorandum on costs of property manufactured by the Ordnance Department.

These costs include:

1. Appropriation or allotment cost.
2. General arsenal burden.
3. War Department burden.

In greater detail these are as follows:

1. Appropriation cost: The amount chargeable to and defrayed from the appropriation to procure the article.

2. General arsenal burden includes:

(a) Capital cost, or interest on capital invested at 3 per cent. Manufacturing buildings, machinery, wagons, etc., per cent in actual use. Administrative buildings, barracks, quarters, hospitals, etc., at 80 per cent actual value for six principal arsenals.

(b) Depreciation: From 2 to 10 per cent a year. Buildings, 2 to 8 per cent, depending on whether frame or concrete, brick or stone, and use. Machinery, 4 to 10 per cent, depending on size and use of tools. Average annual repairs.

(c) Insurance (fire and accident) at 0.3 per cent.

(d) Administrative cost: Eighty per cent of total, pay of officers and enlisted men, subsistence, clothing, care of grounds, medical service, and pay of clerks, etc., paid out of other than manufacturing appropriations.

Arsenal burdens recently determined, as per above: Frankford, 0.0973; Picatinny, 0.1844; Rock Island, 0.1018; Springfield, 0.1256; Watertown, 0.1507; Watervliet, 0.1792.

Average value of six arsenals, 0.1185.

Arsenal burden=(a) + (b) + (c) + (d) and annual appropriation cost of manufacture, repair, and alteration of ordnance and ordnance stores.

3. War Department burden:	Per cent.
1. The Adjutant General's Office	
2. Inspector General's Office	
3. Quartermaster General's Office	
4. Commissary General's Office	
5. Surgeon General's Office	+ 5.7
6. Paymaster General's Office	
7. Pay, commutation heat and light allowances of officers on duty in the above-mentioned bureau offices.	
8. Office of the Secretary of War	
9. Judge Advocate General's Office	
10. Contingent expenses, War Department	
11. Stationery, War Department	
12. Postage to Postal-Union countries	
13. Rent of buildings, War Department (excluding Division of Militia Affairs and Bureau of Insular Affairs)	+ .94
14. Maintenance of State, War, and Navy Department Building (War Department share, 48 per cent)	
15. Interest at 3 per cent on cost of State, War, and Navy Department Building (War Department share, 48 per cent of total)	
16. Proportion of expense of office of Chief of Ordnance which is chargeable to manufacturing operations.	+ 100
17. Pay of retired officers and enlisted men of the Ordnance Department	

The sum of items 1 to 17 include War Department's burden = 0.0359  
Total manufacturing appropriations of Ordnance Department.  
About 1914.

DECEMBER 20, 1915.

HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS,  
Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been turning over in my mind the possibility of saying something on the floor of the House of Representatives in relation to the construction of ships and munitions in Government plants.

Will you please be good enough to send me at your earliest convenience such printed data as you may have on the subject, with reference to the various navy yards and other plants under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, and, particularly, will you please have the following questions answered:

First. In preparing cost data, do the various plants carry as an overhead charge the interest upon the money invested in them; and if so, at what rate of interest?

Second. Is depreciation in value of buildings, machinery, and tools taken into consideration; and if so, what percentage in the various articles?

Third. Do the various plants carry as an overhead charge any amount for supervision from the office of the Secretary of the Navy or the bureau under whose immediate jurisdiction they are working?

Fourth. Are any of the salaries of the officers who have supervision or direction or any kind of control of the work in the plants omitted from the cost data; and if so, to what extent?

Fifth. In purchasing materials, do the plants pay more or less than is paid by private concerns; and if so, why?

Sixth. Do the employees engaged in work in the various plants receive the highest, the average, or a lower rate of pay than that given by private concerns in the same line of business? What comparison would you make as to hours and labor of the men and pay of supervisory force?

Seventh. Is the product produced by the plants superior, equal to, or inferior to the product obtained from private enterprise?

Eighth. What comparison with private enterprise can you make, as to the time required to produce a unit?

Ninth. Do the plants carry in their cost data interest on expenditures from the time of the first outlay until the job is completed?

Tenth. Does the cost data include the expenses of repairs and replacement of tools and machinery and repairs to buildings?

Eleventh. What has been the increased value of plant, real estate, etc., per annum since its original purchase?

If there are no figures available to answer these questions specifically, will you please furnish me, if you can, a general statement which you will approximate as accurately as possible?



Assuring you of my belief in the efficiency of Government work in Government shops and my sincere appreciation of any courtesies extended to me, I am

Yours, sincerely,

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 24, 1916.

HON. CHARLES P. CALDWELL, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CALDWELL: Replying in detail to the questions as to navy-yard costs appearing in your letter of December 20, 1915:

First. Interest on capital invested is not taken into account, it being purely hypothetical in Government work.

Second. Until recently no satisfactory method has been worked out for showing depreciation in costs, owing to the legal impossibility of setting up an actual fund for replacements; consequently up to the present time such a charge has not been included in the cost of work.

Third. The salaries of departmental officials are not included in the cost of work; the establishment charge stops at the yard limits, as to recognize any other principle would extend the question into a purely academic field, including the whole cost of government—executive, legislative, and judicial.

Fourth. The salaries of navy-yard officials have not up to the present time been included in costs, as it has only been within the last few months that a satisfactory method has been developed whereby the cost system is divorced from the system required by law, whereby the pay of officers is charged to an appropriation other than the shipbuilding appropriation.

Fifth. Owing to lack of information as to prices paid for material by private corporations, it is impracticable to make a satisfactory comparison with prices paid by the Government.

Sixth. The rates of wages of navy-yard employees conform to the standard of the private establishments in the immediate vicinity of the respective navy yards. The hours of labor in navy yards are eight per diem. Contracts for new ships built by private establishments contain the following provision: "Subject to the conditions enumerated in section 2 of the eight-hour law of June 19, 1912, no laborer or mechanic doing any part of the work contemplated by this contract in the employ of the contractor or any subcontractor contracting for any part of said work contemplated shall be required or permitted to work more than eight hours in any one calendar day upon such work." The pay of supervisors in private plants must, of course, vary widely in different forms of organization and with the merit of the individual concerned, and comparison with the pay of Government supervisors is scarcely practicable. In general it is believed the standards of pay are much the same.

Seventh. The products of the navy yards and of private plants are manufactured under the same specifications and are subject to the same inspection.

Eighth. The records show that the average time for building the *Connecticut*, *Florida*, and *New York*, all Government-built ships, was 3 years 2 months and 26 days, and that the average time required for the contract-built vessels *Louisiana*, *Utah*, and *Texas* was 3 years 2 months and 16 days.

Ninth. Interest on expenditures from the time of outlay until the work is completed is not taken into account in navy-yard costs, not only because interest is in itself purely hypothetical in Government work, but also because when money is expended at a navy yard for labor and material there is no period of idleness for which interest could be computed, all such expenditures being immediately converted into Government assets in another form.

Tenth. Up to the present time only a part of the expense of repairs and replacements of tools and machinery and repairs to buildings are included in navy-yard costs.

Eleventh. The additions to the industrial navy-yard plants in the United States from the year 1906 are indicated by the following figures, showing value of total investment year by year:

1906	\$97, 118, 756. 28
1907	102, 395, 093. 42
1908	107, 397, 918. 34
1909	112, 135, 600. 51
1910	117, 529, 533. 43
1911	124, 252, 642. 49
1912	130, 081, 736. 61
1913	134, 556, 994. 89
1914	138, 898, 402. 78
1915	143, 269, 953. 76

I will be very glad to furnish you with any further information desired.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,  
Secretary of the Navy.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any sum herein appropriated shall be expended for the purchase of structural steel, ship plates, armor, armament, or machinery from any persons, firms, or corporations who are parties to any existing combination or conspiracy to monopolize the interstate or foreign commerce or trade of the United States, or the commerce or trade between the States and any Territory or the District of Columbia, in any of the articles aforesaid, and no purchase of structural steel, ship plates, or machinery shall be made at a price in excess of a reasonable profit above the actual cost of manufacture. But this limitation shall in no case apply to any existing contract.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Pennsylvania is first entitled to recognition.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I know something about costs in the Government departments, as I have been with a Government department in a certain capacity for a number of years. I know something about the plan of making up costs by the Government. I want to say right here, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that I would not accept any cost established by any de-

partment of the United States Government unless some outside auditing committee went over it in order to prove whether it was correct or not. The gentleman tells us that there are estimates of costs of ships made by the Government, and then they proceed to build them, and that they build them for less than the estimate. Everybody knows that when they make an estimate of cost on anything the Government makes it high enough, so that they can get an appropriation in order to finish it, but that is not proof of the reduction in cost. The only way you can prove an estimate is by bidding by outside parties as to the actual cost of any proposition. That estimate business reminds me of some of these clothing advertisements that we see on the pages of the newspapers, reading:

These pants were \$4; reduced to \$2.99 to-day.

You see that every once in a while. The price is put up, and then they are sold at the actual regular price. And it is called a reduction.

As proof of what I say, the private manufacturers of munitions—and this is known to most everybody, as it has been in every newspaper—employed United States officers connected with the War and Navy Departments to operate their plants down here in New Jersey and throughout the country, assuming by the showing made to the Government that the officers know about the costs. And we find from the newspapers—and the fact was brought out on this floor—the fact that every one of them who had been proving to the Government how cheaply they could make any article, proved failures when they went into the employ of a private manufacturer.

Then gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] showed to you or pointed the way of costs in the Government. You have to take the article, the time in which it takes to make the article, and then count the overhead and all other costs. The money invested and the cost of the plant have to be charged up against that particular time in which you are making an article; and that is the only proof. One time it will cost more than at another, because it takes longer, perhaps, to make it. So that is the only plan on which you can ascertain the real cost. And yet, gentlemen, we find that there are certain men on this floor who have been insisting upon and have been putting in every bill a provision against what they are pleased to call the stop-watch system against the taking of the actual time that is required to make an article. How in the world are you going to ascertain what it costs to make an article? I am for a retirement proposition, and I think that legislation is an enemy to it. We see staggering in every department here—

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. I have only a minute. If the gentleman will go up to any department of the Government he will find old men and old women staggering around there with whom the young, able fellow must be compared in his work. No wonder it costs the Government money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to ask the gentleman if the gentleman, in his judgment, considered the Taylor system a good thing for the workers of this country?

Mr. GARLAND. I never heard of "the Taylor system."

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman mean to say—

Mr. GARLAND. On this floor there was the question of the stop-watch system introduced, but no Taylor system.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman mean to say to the House and the country that he knows nothing about the Taylor efficiency system?

Mr. GARLAND. I do not know anything about Mr. Taylor. I know about the efficiency system.

Mr. KEATING. Do you believe in the stop watch being used?

Mr. GARLAND. I believe in taking the time that is consumed in making an article, in order to get the real cost of it. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Do you believe in using the stop watch on the workers in Government and private plants in this country?

Mr. GARLAND. I believe in using such means of ascertaining time as may be necessary in order to determine the cost to the Government of making an article, and that is what you do not believe in. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is mistaken as to my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND] has expired.



Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SMITH of Idaho: After line 12 insert, on page 62: "That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to have collected and preserved for distribution upon application to the public schools of the country, for preservation and display, the discarded flags and emblems of the United States used in the Navy, when they are no longer serviceable."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman from Tennessee reserve the point of order a moment?

Mr. PADGETT. I reserve it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, under existing regulations the flags that are used in the Navy and also in the Army, when they become soiled to such an extent that they are no longer serviceable, are discarded, collected together, and destroyed. It seems to me that these flags, instead of being destroyed, should be distributed among the public schools throughout the country with a view of inculcating in the youth a spirit of patriotism, and where, I am sure, they would excite greater pride in our Nation's institutions and achievements. [Applause.]

There is no good reason why these flags and emblems should be destroyed, when in most instances they would be serviceable on a public-school building or used for decorative purposes in the schoolroom when no longer suitable, because of discoloration or wear, for use for official purposes. I trust my amendment may be accepted by the gentleman in charge of the bill and allow the House to vote upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any sum herein appropriated under "Increase of the Navy" shall be used for the payment of any clerical, drafting, inspection, or messenger service, or for the pay of any of the other classified force under the various bureaus of the Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SEARS. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, about what?

Mr. SEARS. About the present preparedness proposition; the preparedness of this country and other countries.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman just as lief talk on the pension appropriation bill in general debate?

Mr. SEARS. I never have talked on the pension appropriation bill in general debate or on any other. As my remarks are on the naval bill, which we are now considering, I think now is the time to make them.

Mr. MANN. It will be taken up right away, as I understand. The general debate on the pension bill, I presume, will follow this bill right away.

Mr. SEARS. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that it might affect some votes, although I fear not, on the present bill.

Mr. MANN. I know. It is general debate on the bill. I do not care about the 15 minutes. But if it is effective it is legitimate debate. We expected to finish this bill last Thursday, but we did not finish it then, nor did we finish it on Friday, nor on Saturday, nor yesterday. We may not finish it to-day at the present rate of progress.

Mr. SEARS. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I did not insist the other day on my time, because so many others seemed anxious to speak.

Mr. PADGETT. The Chairman has endeavored and labored and persuaded and tried to get the bill expedited, and has asked time and again to close debate, even going to the extent of moving to close debate. But if gentlemen have something they want to discuss, I do not want to oppose them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, with an appropriation of approximately \$371,000,000 now pending before the House, it seems to me that a request for 15 minutes is not unusual or extreme. I want to congratulate my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore], for his remarks this morning, and I want to congratulate the minority leader for his

numerous statements to the effect that he trusted this country would not get into war.

The reason I have made this request, Mr. Chairman, is because recently from home I received a letter stating the people were excited and believed that in the next few days we would be in war. The second reason is because I have received from a constituent of mine the following letter:

From the daily newspapers we gather that a declaration of war with Germany is inevitable.

I only ask that that part of the letter be inserted. I also received from the chairman of the Democratic committee of Dade County a letter urging the Congress and the people to remain calm and not force this country into a needless war. I will ask, Mr. Chairman, that the letter be published as a part of my remarks.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. How do you expect to convert any votes if you do not read these letters to us? [Laughter.]

Mr. SEARS. The letters are not the main thing, but I will read the letter if the gentleman wants me to, although I am limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. You have 15 minutes in which to convert us.

Mr. SEARS. I will read the letter:

DADE COUNTY DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,  
Miami, Fla., February 6, 1917.

Hon. W. J. SEARS,  
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The stirring events of the last day or so has moved me to write you the result of a partial canvass I have made around the streets of Miami, as to the sentiment regarding the break with Germany and possible war.

Out of 100 people I found 2 who were outspoken for hostilities; 3 who thought the President knew more about the matter than they did, but qualified it by saying that they could not understand why the Nation should be drawn into trouble by a very few people, who insisted on traveling on English and French ships and ships carrying contraband.

Please give the 95 per cent in Dade County your best thought; they have no quarrel with Germany or any other nation; they would be glad to be allowed to continue to prosper; they are ready to defend the United States, but not individuals who evidently are willing to have other people get in trouble for them and their convenience and pleasure.

Yours, truly,

C. D. LEFFLER, Chairman.

But, Mr. Chairman, the letters were not the main reason why I requested time to make these remarks. I have been asked several times if I was on the Committee on Naval Affairs, and when I said I was not, a look of astonishment appeared on the faces of my colleagues, apparently because I dared to delve into this great question that means so much to the people. For the study I have given it I have no apology to make, but I believe the time has come for some man—I had hoped that it would be a statesman of long years and experience—to stand on this floor and tell the American people the exact conditions as they exist and cease trying to frighten our people into believing we are not prepared.

In a report which I hold in my hand, dated January, from Secretary Daniels, I discover that in the English, French, Japanese, Austro-Hungarian, Italian, Russian, German, and Turkish Navies 352 battleships, cruisers, submarines, and so forth, have been destroyed or put out of commission. Of this entire number 284 have been sunk; 171 of these are English; 122 are German.

Mr. PADGETT. Those are not warships. They are commercial ships.

Mr. SEARS. Oh, no; they call them "battleships, submarines," and so forth. I do not know what they are. They say in this report "battleships." I read to you what the Secretary says. He says:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 17, 1917.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT, M. C.  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT: In compliance with the request contained in your letter of January 4, 1917, I am forwarding a photostat copy of a compilation made by the Office of Naval Intelligence showing the men-of-war lost during the present war up to this year.

Additional losses have been reported from confidential sources, but can not, for obvious reasons, be given out at the present time.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

And yet, my friends, with the loss of these 352 battleships, I heard one of my colleagues the other day say the American Navy was not in a position to defend itself.

What are the facts? In 1914, the last comparison we can get, we find England stood first, Germany second, the United States third, France fourth, Japan fifth, and Russia sixth. I can not see how, when a nation has lost 171 of its fighting ships, when another nation has lost 122 of its fighting ships, while the Navy of this Nation, that has been at peace with the world, has lost no ships, and, as a matter of fact, has been building ships from 1914 to the present day, should have deteriorated faster than



the navies of those nations who are still engaged in war and were engaged in war prior to 1914, and have lost so many of their fighting vessels. I felt that the people of the country should know exactly how we stood along this line. In the list of English battleships sunk you find the *Irresistible*, of 15,000 tons; you find the *King Edward VII*, 16,350 tons; the *Audacious*, of 24,000 tons; the *Queen Mary*, and so on; and among the Germans you find the *Pommern* and the *Lützow* and others equally important. And yet an attempt has been made, and is being made daily, by the press to have the American people believe, intentionally or unintentionally, that they are more poorly prepared than they ever were before.

I am sorry I have to speak so fast, but I only have 15 minutes. It will be hard to convince the citizens of the United States we have deteriorated so fast when I remind them that for the Navy since 1913 appropriations by Congress have been made as follows:

1914 (63d Cong., 2d sess.)	\$145,503,963.48
1915 (63d Cong., 3d sess.)	149,763,563.45
1916 (64th Cong., 1st sess.)	312,888,060.25

Total ..... 608,155,587.18

I desire to call your attention to the fact, in addition to the above, since 1884 our Government has spent \$1,710,706,720.91 in an effort to secure a Navy, and in addition to both of the above figures there is appropriated for the hull alone in this bill \$130,600,000. Why have we not secured a Navy? Some one should explain to the country the reason why so much money has been expended, and is being expended, and yet, if we believe the arguments of some, no results have been obtained. Some one should also explain why it is whenever a Navy bill comes before the House all kinds of war talk is engaged in, and every conceivable pressure is brought to bear upon Members of Congress in an effort to secure the passage of said large appropriations.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I will.

Mr. FESS. What proportion of the navy, of the countries which have suffered, has been disabled?

Mr. SEARS. I will answer the gentleman frankly that the figures can not be obtained, because they tell us the information can not be secured. But the chairman of this committee said the other day that it took England, even now, about two or two years and a half to construct a battleship.

Mr. PADGETT. That was under peace conditions.

Mr. FESS. Is it the gentleman's judgment that the five great powers have been substantially harmed by this amount of destruction?

Mr. SEARS. If I had lost 352 battleships, light cruisers, submarines, and so forth, I should think I had been substantially harmed. I believe the gentleman will admit that to be the case.

Mr. FESS. There are no such things as 352 battleships lost.

Mr. SEARS. I said battleships, light cruisers, submarines, torpedo boats, destroyers, and so forth. To be frank, I think England has lost eight battleships.

Mr. EAGLE. Out of 82.

Mr. SEARS. No; out of 64. According to the figures for 1914, the United States has 17 superdreadnaughts, the Japanese have 4. The United States has no battle cruisers, and the Japanese have 4. The United States has 22 battleships of the dreadnaught type, while the Japanese have only 12.

Mr. PADGETT. Twenty-two predreadnaughts.

Mr. SEARS. Twenty-two predreadnaughts, and the Japanese 12. We have 10 armored cruisers, they have 13. We have 14 cruisers, and they have 12, showing that we are better prepared than the Japanese. These are the figures for 1914. We can not get the information since that year. Yet in the face of this showing that we are better prepared than they are, the Japanese question is always raised in this country when some people want extra appropriations for the Navy.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. In just a minute. We now have five battleships of the larger type under construction and four contracted for. Besides there are seven ships of the larger type that have been appropriated for but not yet contracted for, and yet in this bill we are asked to make the enormous appropriation of \$83,500,000 for battleships and cruisers—and this amount only pays for the hulls—that the chairman of the committee tells us can not, under present conditions, be completed within the next six or eight years.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no.

Mr. SEARS. In addition to the above, the cost of the four battle cruisers provided for at the last session is increased from \$16,500,000 to \$19,000,000 each, and scout cruisers from \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000, a handsome profit for some one. And yet the House refused to place a time limit for the completion of any or all of

the above, and in fact voted down an amendment requiring that same should be completed within not exceeding 38 months; although the chairman has stated that England is completing similar ships in two and a half year or less, I submit no business man would enter into a contract without some similar limitation.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Speaking about the comparative strength of the Navy of this country and that of Japan, I want to call attention to the fact that while perhaps the gentleman's figures are correct—though I think he has left out about four battleships that Japan has recently constructed—

Mr. SEARS. You can not get the figures since 1914.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. My information is that four battleships have recently been launched in Japan. Anyway, I want to call attention to the fact that so far as the Pacific coast is concerned we are practically defenseless. We have no battleship squadron over there, never have had, and there is no prospect that we ever will have.

Mr. SEARS. I can see no reason why some of our battleships are not on the Pacific, and I sincerely trust the gentleman is in error when he says "There is no prospect that we ever will have" any on the Pacific. If I can assist him, I will gladly do so.

I can not at this time go into the hundreds of merchant vessels that have been sunk, as my time will not permit.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want to inject this statement: That according to the statements of the experts before our committee, if our fleet was five times as large as it is they would not spread it out all over the ocean, but would operate it together from the same base.

Mr. SEARS. I thank my colleague [Mr. CALLAWAY] for the information.

Mr. Chairman, as a small boy whenever I was scared I began to whistle to keep up my courage, and if I dared to look over my shoulder more than twice, regardless of whatever bravery I might have, my feet took me away from the spot as rapidly as I could go. And remembering this I want to say, unless some of the papers of this country cease trying to alarm and thus drive the American people into a panic-stricken condition, if we should go to war—God grant we never will—we can not win victories. And this certainly should not be done when the facts are to the contrary.

It is needless for me to remind the Members of this House of the result of the Mexican War, because history has written too well how that war came out. It is needless for me to remind you of the War of 1776, for again history records the result. Yet I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that no people were more unprepared than were those pioneer people of 1776. In 1812 Americans aimed with a true eye and shot with accuracy, and history again records the result of that war. In 1898, though Spain never sank the *Maine*, again history records the outcome of that war. In each and every one of these wars the Stars and Stripes were victorious. Yet we were not prepared then, and for some reason some would have you believe we are not prepared now. Mr. Chairman, I will not refer to 1861-1865. Permit me only to say that those years produced to this country Grant and Lee, and hundreds of others too numerous to name. Our country has given us a George Washington, an Abraham Lincoln, a Jeff Davis, and hundreds of others whose names are a glorious memory, and I for one will not believe that all of the blue blood that coursed through their veins has been exhausted. I for one refuse to believe that the young American manhood of to-day has degenerated until they are only a set of mollicoddles, who can be whipped by any nation on God's green earth. [Applause.] I sincerely trust that this country will remain at peace, I believe it will remain at peace, and I want to congratulate our President for keeping us out of war in the past. I firmly believe when he stands at the window and looks across the Potomac, and loses sight for the moment of the scare and inciting headlines, he will remember the people who indorsed him for another four years, and that he will continue to keep us out of war as long as he can do so with honor to this country. [Applause.] But as I said in my last campaign, Mr. Chairman, that my people might know how I stood, I would not be a Member of Congress who was invincible in time of peace, but invisible in times of war; and if it ever become necessary for me to vote for war, I told my constituents that I would offer my services along with them to fight for the flag that they, as well as myself, love so well. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I will not discuss our present Secretary of the Navy. He needs no defense at my hands, and history will record him in his true light, a friend of the people and his country.



I am not opposed to a reasonable amount of preparedness, but I am opposed to this bill, because to my mind it is not in the interest of preparedness. I reach this conclusion, first, because the House refused to accept the time limit of 38 months for the completion of the vessels from the date same might be contracted for; in fact, they failed to put any time limit for the completion of said vessels. Second, I believe the present war has fully demonstrated that we need more submarines and not so many large battleships, and the House refused to accept an amendment with this end in view. There are other reasons why I am opposed to this bill, some of which were explained in my previous remarks, but I will not take time to go into those matters at present.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin was recognized.

Mr. PADGETT. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Five minutes will be ample.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS], who has just taken his seat, spoke somewhat carelessly, I thought, about the possibility of our country becoming a party to the great war across the sea. In expressing his willingness to enter the war, the gentleman did not seem to me really to appreciate what his statement means. But the London Times understands what it means for this Nation to be to-day in the situation in which the President has placed it by severing diplomatic relations with Germany. Let me ask the attention of the gentleman from Florida to an excerpt from an editorial in that paper.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield in the five minutes allowed me. In the London Times appeared this solemn and significant editorial statement:

"The act of President Wilson is an event of measureless importance in the history of mankind. Whatever the immediate consequences of the breach, a new chapter is opened for the New World and the Old. For the first time since it became a great power the United States has directly intervened in a European war—a course pregnant with untold results hereafter."

Mark those words—"a course pregnant with untold results hereafter."

If we become a party to the war, are we to take part in the terms of settlement when the bloody cataclysm has ended? The President, in his address to the Senate before the severance of diplomatic relations, said that we, of course, would have nothing to do with the terms of settlement; but, according to the London Times, and if we are to help fight out this war, will we not have something to do with them? After we have fought, after soldiers whom we send across the sea have been killed, after our ships have been sunk and our sailors drowned, are we to join in the company around the table when the final settlement comes?

Who owns the London Times? Lord Northcliffe, whom I heard the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] mention as I entered the Chamber this morning. And this reminds me, Mr. Chairman, that in the New Republic there recently appeared an article—"The problem of Northcliffe"—by Norman Angell, an English publicist and editor of distinction, in which he calls attention to the fact that Lord Northcliffe, or the trust of which he is the head, owns and controls 60 newspapers, magazines, and periodicals in England alone. And I have been told by a newspaper editor of wide information, and one in whose word I have confidence, that Lord Northcliffe has a controlling financial interest in a leading paper in Holland, from which we see editorial excerpts reprinted almost every day in this country, and that he has also a controlling interest in the Novoe Vremya, the chief daily newspaper in Petrograd, Russia.

I have only time remaining to read again the grave comment of the London Times:

"For the first time since it became a great power, the United States has directly intervened in a European war—a course pregnant with untold results hereafter." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any sum appropriated by this act shall be used for any expense of the Navy Department at Washington, D. C., unless specific authority is given by law for such expenditure.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which, by order of the committee, I was to do when we returned to page 5.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 5, after line 7, insert as a separate paragraph:

"To enable the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to secure, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, such basic patent or patents as they may consider necessary to the manufacture and development of aircraft in the United States and its dependencies for governmental and civil purposes under such regulations as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That such arrangements may be made in relation to the purchase of any basic patent connected with the manufacture and development of aircraft in the United States as in the judgment of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy will be of the greatest advantage to the Government and to the development of the industry: *Provided further*, That in the event there shall be pending in court litigation involving the validity of said patent or patents bond, with good and approved security in an amount sufficient to indemnify the United States, shall be required, payable to the United States, conditioned to repay to the United States the amount paid for said patent or patents in the event said patent or patents are finally adjudged invalid."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. This amendment authorizes the condemnation of the basic aircraft patents for governmental and civil purposes. What is meant by the term "civil purposes"?

Mr. PADGETT. For use of the public under such regulations as Congress may see fit to authorize when the Government becomes the owner.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that the Government can condemn property in order to give it to the public, and not use it for governmental purposes?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the Government can condemn it and acquire the ownership for public use; that it is not limited to the Government use after the Government becomes the owner of it. It is not restricted to the Government in using it exclusively for itself.

Mr. MANN. That has nothing to do with the question. When we condemn property the Government has to show its right to commence condemnation proceedings. Can the Government condemn property except for Government uses?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not, except for public uses. I think it could condemn property for a public use.

Mr. MANN. What kind of a public use?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, like the condemnation of land for a railway.

Mr. MANN. Railways are governmental uses. What right has the Government to condemn property for civil purposes, not meaning governmental uses at all?

Mr. PADGETT. The Government can condemn it for public use, and when it becomes the owner it can permit the public to use it upon such terms as it sees proper to authorize through legislation.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think it can condemn property for the purpose of giving it to the gentleman from Tennessee, wholly apart for governmental use?

Mr. PADGETT. The Government can condemn it if it has any use for the public, and through legislation can authorize it to be used by the public.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the courts will hold, but certainly no court has ever held that the Government could condemn property except for the use by the Government for public purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. There can be a public civil use, which is illustrated in condemning land for railroads and the condemnation for rights of way and public parks. They are uses by the civil population.

Mr. MANN. That is entirely apart from this question.

Mr. PADGETT. They occur to me as good illustrations.

Mr. MANN. The purpose here is, as indicated by the report of the Secretary of the Navy, to condemn the basic patents in order to give the people the use of them.

Mr. PADGETT. No; not to give it to them, but, if they condemn it, the United States would be the owner just as any individual would be the owner, and the control of that ownership would be vested in the Government.

Mr. MANN. I am directing the gentleman's attention to the language in the amendment. My judgment is that it renders doubtful the right of the Government to condemn it at all by including this language, "for civil purposes."

Mr. PADGETT. Perhaps it is not necessary to have that in there, and if it casts any doubt upon it, it would not interfere with anything to strike out "for civil purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.



Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. The last proviso is that if the basic patents are in dispute, and they are in dispute, I believe, the Government shall require the owners of the patents to furnish a bond to the United States to protect the United States. How can you condemn property, and then after having condemned it require the owner to give you a bond before he turns it over to you?

Mr. PADGETT. That can not be done, but we were assured in the hearings by Dr. Walcott, who had been negotiating with these people, that it could be consummated by negotiations.

Mr. MANN. But here is the point that I am getting at, so that the gentleman will understand. It is perfectly patent to me, though I may not be correct, that you can not buy this property for a million dollars by private contract. What it will cost in the end I do not know, but when you go to condemn property you have to have legislation that permits the condemnation proceedings to be carried on, and if you provide as a basis of your right to condemn property something you can not do, that is a defense to your condemnation proceeding which will defeat it.

Mr. PADGETT. Dr. Walcott stated that with the negotiations that have taken place with the present owners of the patents—the Wrights have transferred all of their ownership to a corporation—it has been indicated that the whole right to the patent could be secured for not exceeding \$1,000,000, and perhaps for less than that, and they were expecting to secure it by negotiations, and that the bond matter was suggested by him.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, by this provision we are launching the Government for the first time in its history into an untried sea of adventure. If we adopt this policy to-day, I fear we shall be called upon frequently in the future to take similar action. Whenever the patentee of some device which is needed by the Government asks a reasonable royalty for its use, the Government officials will come to Congress and ask for a large appropriation with which to purchase the rights to the patent. What are the facts in the case? It is admitted that this patent is disputed in the courts and that for many months, if not many years, there have been pending in the district court of the United States in the city of New York a suit brought by and on behalf of the original owners, the Wrights, against the Curtiss Co. for an infringement by the Curtiss Co. of the basic patents. These are sought to be purchased by the Government or condemned by the Government under the amendment under consideration. It has been testified to, and it has not been disputed, that whenever that case comes to trial the owners of the patent ask to have the hearing deferred. They virtually, by their action in court, admit that they have questionable ground on which to base their claim to a patent.

Mr. PADGETT. The case has been tried in the lower court, and the lower court decided in favor of the validity of the patent and against the Curtiss people, the defendants. There was an appeal taken by the Curtiss people, and that appeal is pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman deny that whenever that appeal has been brought up for consideration it has been deferred, and why? Because the claimants to the patent presumably have little faith whatever in their claim. Even Dr. Walcott, who was the original promoter of this provision—and he only conceived it since the recent unsettled condition in the country due to the break in diplomatic relations with Germany—admits that there is grave doubt whether there is any virtue whatever in this basic patent, because it is claimed that it is not original, and that the feature of novelty is lacking in the Wright patents. The Wrights have recently sold their patent rights to a company known as the Wright-Martin Co. for over a million dollars, and that company is capitalized for \$5,000,000. The gentleman from Tennessee is entirely in error, and it is borne out by the hearings before the committee—and I have read them all, otherwise I would not make the statement so positively—in his statement that the present owners of the so-called Wright patents refused to sell the patent rights to the Government for such use as it wished for governmental and private purposes for \$1,000,000. They are willing to allow the Government to use the patents for a million dollars and to have private contractors pay royalties for their use.

What is the exigency that demands the purchase by the Government of these patents? In the hearings before the gentleman's own committee—and I call his attention to that fact, because perhaps he may not have that matter so clearly in

mind—when Capt. McKean, the head of the Aviation Service, was before the committee, he testified as to the ease with which he could obtain these airships. He said, at page 483:

Some of them are coming pretty fast. We are getting certain types now pretty fast.

In all the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs and before the Military Affairs Committee, which run into numerous pages, there is not one line of testimony to show that the Government has had any difficulty whatever in obtaining these airships for the use of the Navy or the Army.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FARR. Does not Capt. McKean say that we are getting them as fast as one a month?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. FARR. Yes; he does.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will ask the gentleman to point that out.

Mr. FARR. It is in the testimony.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am pointing out that he said that some of them are coming pretty fast and that they were getting certain types pretty fast now. Neither Capt. Squier, who is the head of the Aviation Service, connected with the Army, nor Capt. McKean, who is in charge of this service, connected with the Navy, made any complaint whatever as to the difficulty in obtaining these airships for the Government. I go further. Even Dr. Walcott, when he testified in January in the regular hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee, did not complain about the difficulty of getting the airships for the use of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. What did the patentees ask from the Government? Not an exorbitant sum. They asked for a royalty of only 5 per cent. Anyone can see that that is not an exorbitant sum.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield.

Mr. PADGETT. Dr. Walcott says it is generally recognized among the profession that 2 per cent is a large royalty instead of 5 being a reasonable royalty.

Mr. STAFFORD. If anyone will read the testimony of Dr. Walcott before the committee he will come to the conclusion, with all due deference to Dr. Walcott, who is an eminent scientist, but not a business man, that he had little information as to the willingness of the owners to transfer the patent rights to the Government. The advisory committee on aeronautics, of which he is the head, that considered this question, comprises nothing but scientists, men connected with educational institutions, and there is not one business man connected with it.

The question before the committee in the adoption of this amendment is purely a business one. We have a right as a Government under the act passed in 1906 to appropriate for the use of the Government any patent and use it for governmental purposes and compensate the patentee in the Court of Claims a reasonable allowance for the use of that patent. We have provided here that in case of war or other exigency in the determination of the President he may commandeer the private yards for the use of the Government. If there is an exigency arising in reference to our present strained relations with Germany the President can commandeer any private establishment and can direct—

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not in the middle of a sentence. He can direct their use for the making of these airships and can use any patent or device whatever in the use of them, and then the patentee can have the right to go to the Court of Claims and have the damages assessed, and in that suit the Government has the right to set up as a defense any ground of infringement or validity of the patent. I respectfully submit to the committee we should not launch into this untried experiment. There is no occasion for it. In case the Government was in need of airships that could not be obtained by private employment, that would be one thing, but there is no showing whatsoever in the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs or in the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs of any difficulty of getting these airships in such quantities as are needed. The only argument of Dr. Walcott is this—

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield when he has finished the sentence?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield before proceeding on this line of thought.



Mr. FARR. The evidence was this: That with a tremendous need for airships, with all the facilities we have in this country we can not build more than 100 to 125 a month.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, if anyone has studied the situation as to the needs of the Government, both of the Army and the Navy, he will agree that 100 to 125 is more than the Government needs.

Mr. FARR. No; a thousand we need.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any further at this moment. The reason advanced by Dr. Walcott that the Government purchase these is not that the Government needs them in obtaining additional airships, but we should come to the relief of owners or prospective inventors of improvements on the basic patents, so that the industry may be developed. There is a concern in Boston, backed by some money, that can not go ahead or is unwilling to go ahead with the payment of this royalty to the present owners of the Wright patents. The terms that the present owners of the Wright patent insist upon when it is used by another are that a payment of \$10,000 on the base of a royalty of 5 per cent on the valuation of output, and anything above that output they would pay a royalty of 5 per cent—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a moment—the gentleman wants to have the facts clearly before the committee?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The evidence before the Committee on Naval Affairs was that the Wright-Martin Co. insist upon a payment of \$10,000 cash and 5 per cent on all the sales up to \$200,000 a year. Those are the royalty terms being insisted upon by the Wright-Martin Co. that control the basic patents on flying machines.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read the testimony, they require \$10,000 as a condition precedent to the use of the patents—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Ten thousand dollars a year?

Mr. STAFFORD. Ten thousand dollars a year.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And 5 per cent on sales above \$200,000?

Mr. STAFFORD. And if they manufacture devices above a valuation of \$200,000 they are to pay in excess of that 5 per cent. It is a question whether at this time we should purchase a doubtful patent for a million dollars. We certainly have no right to take the patent for private use. We have already provided in the commandeering section the power to appropriate these patents, and there is the law of 1906 that enables the patentee to recover only the reasonable value for the use of the patent in the Court of Claims.

Mr. TALBOTT. It may be a doubtful patent, and if we acquire a doubtful patent and it is declared to be invalid we lose something.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing to be gained by the Government, looking only from a governmental standpoint. If we adopt this policy now, then as to every invention involving, for example, a submarine, a gun, or a basic patent of any kind, we will be called upon perchance by some advisory committee to appropriate an amount of money the patentee may see fit to ask of us, for the reason, as advanced in this instance, that the industry will thereby be developed.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to know if this Aero Club that has been inflicting so much of its literature on the Members of Congress is in this business.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the testimony of Dr. Walcott before the Naval Affairs Committee—and this afterthought of his was since strained diplomatic relations have arisen—he stated it was but the opinion of the Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, which, as I said, is composed only of college professors. It is a scheme to aid some private concerns who own patents for improvements on the basic patent, so that they will be relieved of paying a royalty.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, aircraft, heavier-than-air flying machines, were really originated by Dr. S. P. Langley when he was Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. He did his work and made his investigations and experiments largely out of a fund which we had appropriated to the Army and which was applied by them through Dr. Langley for this purpose. He probably would have

made a complete success except for the fact that the House at one time, as I remember, put a provision in the appropriation bill forbidding the use of the appropriation to the Army for this purpose. But he did make a flying machine which flew. The Wright brothers, to whom the country is under great obligations for the brilliant success which they made in putting the flying machine into use, took the ideas of Dr. Langley, and when the matter came into litigation subsequently the old flying machine which Dr. Langley flew was resurrected and put in a state of preservation in the Smithsonian Institution. I do not know how far that flying machine was used in the contest over the patent, but I assume that it was put in evidence in the suit which the Wright brothers had against the Curtiss Co.—I am not sure about the name, though I think I am right—as to the basic patent. My understanding is that that litigation is not finally disposed of. I have had the impression, although I may be entirely wrong about that, that the Wright brothers and the Curtiss Co. had reached or were about to reach a working agreement. It may be desirable for the Government to have the right to let anybody manufacture a flying machine under contract to sell it to the Government, or under a contract with the Government. I am inclined to think that is desirable. And it may be that the amendment offered now will accomplish that purpose.

I am inclined to think that in the end the Wright brothers' patent will not be held valid as to the basic patent if it is finally adjudicated in court. The Wright brothers' patent at the best runs out in six years. I suppose it is true that during the next six years, with the condition of mind that now exists in the country, and I fear is likely to continue, we will have a great many flying machines constructed for or by the Government of the United States. And I am inclined to join in that feeling, though I am not as hysterical as some gentlemen are about it. It is unfortunate that the Government of the United States when it grants a patent on an article to be used mainly by the Government, or which may be useful for the Government as a matter of defensive or offensive action, does not retain the right to use the patent either without compensation or by paying a reasonable compensation for its use. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will not undertake to discuss this question as an expert, but I have given it considerable thought. The aeroplane, or flying machine, evidently is an important factor in all modern warfare and warfare in the future. If a set of individuals control a lot of basic patents all the development of that institution will be controlled by the men who control those basic patents. I call to mind that the Singer Sewing Machine Co., I think, drew a royalty from every other sewing-machine company on earth, because no matter how much improvement they made they still had to use a needle with an eye in the point, and therefore the entire sewing-machine industry of the world was controlled by the man who held a patent, which was that of an eye in the point of a needle. Now, the same condition relates to these inventions, and if the Government paid a million dollars to open these flying machines to public thought, public ingenuity, and allowed this industry to be developed without extortionate royalties, and the public get the benefit of it, I am one of those who believe we had better cut off one or two big battleships and invest the money that way, for it is far more material as a means of defense. I am one of those who believe that the day will come when our aeronautic stations will be dotted all along our coast line, and a survey and a scouting expedition will be made a thousand miles over the ocean to locate an enemy and ascertain how to kill him off if he ever undertakes to land in this country. I say that this necessity is vital, and I want it to go through. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to just put in the RECORD the form of applications, requirements, and exactions in order to enable a private manufacturer to manufacture aeroplanes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to insert certain documents in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following are the documents referred to:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, February 9, 1917.

HON. LEMUEL P. PADGETT,  
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On the 6th instant I transmitted to your committee certain recommendations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which have been approved by the President, Secretary of War, and Secretary of the Navy, and also a statement containing extracts from some letters received from manufacturers of aircraft in response to an inquiry from the executive committee of the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics of the effect upon aircraft patent litigation.



I attach hereto a copy of the application for license and form of agreement of the Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation, which may also be of service to you in consideration of the suggestions transmitted in my letter of the 6th.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

#### APPENDIX B.

#### APPLICATION FOR LICENSE AND FORM OF AGREEMENT OF THE WRIGHT-MARTIN AIRCRAFT CORPORATION.

DEAR SIR: The title to the basic Wright patent on aeroplanes has just been acquired by Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation. This corporation believes that it is for the best interests of aeronautics that all responsible makers of aeroplanes should be free to conduct their business without danger of suit under this patent. Accordingly a standard form of license agreement has been drawn up, a copy of which is inclosed. It is our intention to grant a license in this form to any corporation that desires to undertake the obligations of the agreement. In regard to corporations that have in the past manufactured aeroplanes in infringement of this patent, we plan to waive all claims for past damages or profits upon making a payment as outlined in the inclosed application.

If you desire to acquire a license, please read the inclosed papers and return the application and license to us properly executed, together with your check. Royalties that accrue during the balance of this year may be treated as though accruing during January, 1917.

To the manufacturers and corporations whom we accept as licensees under this patent we give the benefit of national publicity carried on by us. This means that everyone interested will thoroughly understand that machines built under this patent employ the universally adopted and basic principles of control for aeroplanes—the Wright patent—which has been sustained. Its new owners do not intend to allow it to be disregarded.

Yours, very truly,

WRIGHT-MARTIN AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,  
By EDWARD M. HAGAR, President.

#### APPLICATION FOR LICENSE.

The \_\_\_\_\_, a corporation of \_\_\_\_\_, hereby applies to Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation for a license under Wright patent No. 821,393 of May 22, 1906.

In connection with this application the applicant submits herewith an executed and acknowledged copy of the license agreement into which it desires to enter a sworn statement setting forth in detail the gross receipts of applicant in the aeronautical business since January 1, 1916, and a check for \$10,000 plus 5 per cent of the amount of such gross receipts. (For aeroplanes sold substantially complete except for motors and motor accessories 10 per cent is included.) It is understood that Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation will within 30 days from the receipt hereof either accept this offer by sending to applicant a duplicate of such license agreement, duly executed and acknowledge by its authorized officers, or will return to applicant this statement and the check sent herewith.

By \_\_\_\_\_,

#### STATEMENT.

I, \_\_\_\_\_, as \_\_\_\_\_ of and on behalf of \_\_\_\_\_, hereby represent to Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation that the following is a complete statement showing the gross receipts made since January 1, 1916, in the aeronautical business, by the corporation, on behalf of which this statement is made, and I understand that the representations contained herein are material representations made to induce said Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation to grant to the corporation, on behalf of which the statement is made, a license under Wright patent No. 821,393, dated May 22, 1906. In order that such statement may be verified, I, on behalf of the corporation for which this statement is made, hereby authorize Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation, by its duly authorized agent, to inspect the books of account of such corporation and its subsidiary corporations engaged in the aeronautical business at any time within 30 days of the receipt of this statement by the Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation.

#### TABLE OF GROSS RECEIPTS.

Company, _____ Co.:	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane sales (with power plant) _____	
Motor sales _____	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane part sales _____	
Motor part sales _____	
Repair sales _____	
Accessory sales (instruments, etc.) _____	
Miscellaneous sales _____	
Aviation school tuition _____	
Miscellaneous income aviation school _____	
Aviation exhibitions _____	
Total _____	
5 per cent of total _____	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane sales (without power plant) _____	
10 per cent of total _____	
Total _____	
Subsidiary company "A" _____ Co.:	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane sales (with power plant) _____	
Motor sales _____	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane part sales _____	
Motor part sales _____	
Repair sales _____	
Accessory sales (instruments, etc.) _____	
Miscellaneous sales _____	
Aviation school tuition _____	
Miscellaneous income aviation school _____	
Aviation exhibitions _____	
Total _____	
5 per cent of total _____	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane sales (without power plant) _____	
10 per cent of total _____	
Total _____	

Subsidiary company "B," _____ Co.:	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane sales (with power plant) _____	
Motor sales _____	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane part sales _____	
Motor part sales _____	
Repair sales _____	
Accessory sales (instruments, etc.) _____	
Miscellaneous sales _____	
Aviation school tuition _____	
Miscellaneous income aviation school _____	
Aviation exhibitions _____	
Total _____	
5 per cent of total _____	
Aeroplane and hydroaeroplane sales (without power plant) _____	
10 per cent of total _____	
Total _____	

#### SYNOPSIS OF GROSS RECEIPTS.

Company	Sales.	Royalty.
Subsidiary company "A" _____		
Subsidiary company "B" _____		
Total _____		
		On behalf of _____

STATE OF \_\_\_\_\_,  
County \_\_\_\_\_, ss:

\_\_\_\_\_, being duly sworn, deposes and says: I am the \_\_\_\_\_ of the corporation, on behalf of which the foregoing statement is made, and am familiar with its business. I have read the foregoing statement and know the contents thereof, and that the same is true to the best of my knowledge and belief, and I further state that I have the power to authorize the inspection of the books of such corporation and its subsidiaries as granted in said statement.

Sworn to before me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 191\_\_\_\_.

Notary Public.

Agreement made this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 191\_\_\_\_, between Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation, a corporation of New York, hereinafter termed the "licensor" and \_\_\_\_\_, a corporation of \_\_\_\_\_, hereinafter termed the "licensee."

Whereas the licensor is the owner of United States Letters Patent No. 821,393, issued on May 22, 1906, to Orville and Wilbur Wright, for flying machines, and the licensee is desirous of obtaining a license thereunder:

Now, therefore, it is agreed as follows:

1. The licensor grants to the licensee a nonexclusive license to make, sell, and use flying machines embodying the inventions described in said letters patent, together with parts thereof, throughout the United States and its Territories and dependencies, and to make or sell such flying machines and parts thereof within the United States and its Territories and dependencies for use or sale abroad.

2. The licensee admits that said letters patent are good and valid in law and cover all types of heavier-than-air flying machines having one or more supporting planes in which it is possible to vary the lifting power of one wing in relation to the lifting power of the other wing through the medium of wing warping or by the use of one or more ailerons or by any other means.

3. The licensor hereby releases the licensee from all claims for past infringement of said patent.

4. In consideration of the foregoing license, the licensee agrees that it will pay to the licensor for the terms of said license 5 per cent of the gross receipts of the licensee or any subsidiary or controlled selling corporation, received in connection with the manufacture, use, or sale of said heavier-than-air flying machines, such gross receipts to include among other things all sums received for the sale of complete aeroplanes equipped with motors, or parts of aeroplanes, aeroplane engines, instruments used on aeroplanes, or other accessories, together with receipts from aviation exhibitions or aviation schools conducted by the licensee, but it is particularly understood that if the licensee shall sell aeroplanes substantially complete except for the motor and motor accessories, the license fee for such aeroplanes only shall be 10 per cent of the gross receipts therefrom. It is further provided that from all such gross receipts there may be deducted the amount of any invoices for aeroplanes, engines, parts, or accessories purchased from the licensor. The licensee further agrees that for the term of this license it will pay to the licensor a minimum royalty at the rate of not less than \$10,000 per year. Such minimum royalties shall be payable as provided in paragraphs 5 and 8 hereof.

5. To insure the payments of royalties hereunder, the licensee agrees that on or before the 1st day of January of each year throughout the term of this license it will pay to the licensor the minimum royalty above specified for the ensuing year (except that on January 1, 1923, the sum shall be five-twelfths of such sum.) Such minimum payment shall forthwith become the property of the licensor, but in the event that the actual royalties upon the business in any year, based on the gross receipts of the licensee in accordance with paragraph 4 hereof, are less than the said sum of \$10,000, the licensee shall be credited with such difference, to be applied to the payment of future royalties, in the event that for the business in any year or years thereafter the royalties under this license are in excess of said minimum sum of \$10,000.

The licensee further agrees that on the 10th day of each April, July, October, and January during the terms of this license, it will render to the licensor sworn statements showing its gross receipts in the aeronautical business as defined in paragraph 3 hereof for the preceding quarter year. When any such statement shows that the royalties accrued for that portion of the calendar year for which the statement is rendered are in excess of the minimum sum paid in advance for that year, the licensee agrees that at the time it renders such statement to the licensor it will pay to the licensor the amount of such excess, and that in rendering statements for the business done in the balance of that year it will pay the royalty accrued without any deduction.



6. The licensee agrees to keep full and complete books of account concerning its aeronautical business as defined in paragraph 4 hereof, and to allow the duly accredited agent of the licensor to inspect such books at all reasonable business hours.

7. The licensee agrees that it will attach to each flying machine it sells under this license a name plate bearing the licensee's name, a serial number, and the statement "Licensed under United States Patent No. 821393 of May 22, 1906."

8. This license shall remain in force until the 23d day of May, 1923, but it is particularly provided that if the licensee shall fail to pay the royalties provided for in paragraph 4 hereof, or to render the statements and make the payments provided for in paragraphs 4 and 5 hereof, the licensor shall have the option (a) of cancelling this license by giving the licensee 30 days' notice in writing of its intention so to do, unless the breach complained of is remedied within said 30-day period, or (b) of electing that the minimum royalties provided for hereunder for all of the remaining years of the license are forthwith due and payable to the licensor without discount. The election by the licensor of either of the foregoing remedies shall not deprive the licensor of the right to recover any sums due under this agreement.

9. Upon the termination of this license for any cause the licensee agrees to make to the licensor a sworn statement such as is provided for in paragraph 4 hereof, which shall not only include the gross receipts for the licensee's aeronautical business but likewise an inventory of all complete or partially completed articles, which if they had been sold would have been the basis for royalty under this agreement, and the licensee agrees to pay royalty on the market value of all such complete or partially completed articles.

10. Nothing in this license shall be construed as granting to the licensee any rights under any other patent owned or controlled by the licensor, and the licensee particularly agrees that it will not use the name "Wright" in connection with flying machines.

11. The licensor agrees that if it grants licenses on terms other than those upon which this license is granted (except for the terms on which releases are granted for claims for past infringement), it will notify the licensee and permit it, at its option, to accept such other form of license in place of this one.

12. This agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their successors, legal representatives, and assigns, but the license herein granted shall not be divisible and shall be assignable only with the entire business and good will of the licensee.

In witness whereof the parties have caused this instrument to be executed by their officers thereunto duly authorized.

By WRIGHT-MARTIN AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,  
\_\_\_\_\_, President.

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_, Secretary.

By \_\_\_\_\_, President.

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_, Secretary.

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
County of New York, ss:

On this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 191\_\_\_\_, before me, a notary public, personally appeared Edward M. Hagar and James G. Dudley, to me known, who being by me severally duly sworn, did depose and say that they are respectively the president and secretary of Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation, one of the corporations described in and which executed the foregoing license agreement, that they know the seal of said corporation, that the seal affixed to said agreement is the seal of said corporation, and that they affixed such seal and signed their names to said agreement by virtue of authority vested in them by the board of directors of said corporation.

\_\_\_\_\_, Notary Public.

STATE OF \_\_\_\_\_,  
County of \_\_\_\_\_, ss:

On this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 191\_\_\_\_, before me, a notary public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, to me known, who being by me severally duly sworn, did depose and say that they are respectively the president and secretary of \_\_\_\_\_, one of the corporations described in and which executed the foregoing license agreement, that they know the seal of said corporation, that the seal affixed to said agreement is the seal of said corporation, and that they affixed such seal and signed their names to said agreement by virtue of authority vested in them by the board of directors of said corporation.

\_\_\_\_\_, Notary Public.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20632, the naval appropriation bill, and had instructed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reports that that committee has had under consideration the naval appropriation bill, and directs him to report it back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks] be excused indefinitely, on account of serious illness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks] be excused indefinitely, on account of serious illness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send it up. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OLIVER moves to recommit H. R. 20632 to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to report the same forthwith to the House with the following amendments:

"Strike out all appropriations for 2 of the 3 battleships now carried in the bill and insert in lieu thereof appropriations for the construction of 30 destroyers instead of 15 and for 30 submarines instead of 18, the type and cost of such additional destroyers and submarines to be the same as those now carried in the bill."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division, and, pending that, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama demands a division and makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-two gentlemen have risen—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for a division and demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws his demand for a division and demands the yeas and nays. Those who favor taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-three gentlemen have risen in the affirmative—not a sufficient number—and the yeas and nays are denied. The motion to recommit is lost. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MANN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill. Those in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number. The Clerk will call the roll. Those who favor the passage of the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 353, nays 23, answered "present" 2, not voting 55, as follows:

YEAS—353.

Abercrombie	Bruckner	Coleman	Dickinson
Adair	Brumbaugh	Collier	Dies
Adamson	Buchanan, Tex.	Connelly	Dill
Aiken	Burgess	Conry	Dillon
Alexander	Burke	Cooper, Ohio	Dixon
Allen	Butler	Cooper, W. Va.	Dooling
Almon	Byrnes, S. C.	Cooper, Wis.	Doolittle
Anderson	Byrns, Tenn.	Copley	Doremus
Ashbrook	Caldwell	Costello	Dowell
Aswell	Candler, Miss.	Cox	Driscoll
Austin	Cannon	Crago	Drukner
Ayres	Cantrill	Crisp	Dunn
Bacharach	Capstick	Crosser	Dupré
Barkley	Caraway	Cullop	Dyer
Barnhart	Carlin	Curry	Eagan
Bell	Carter, Mass.	Dale, N. Y.	Eagle
Benedict	Carter, Okla.	Dale, Vt.	Elston
Black	Cary	Dallinger	Emerson
Blackmon	Casey	Danforth	Esch
Boeber	Chandler, N. Y.	Darrow	Estopinal
Borland	Charles	Davis, Minn.	Evas
Bowers	Church	Decker	Farley
Britten	Clark, Fla.	Dempsey	Farr
Browne	Cline	Denison	Fess
Browning	Coady	Dent	Fields



Fitzgerald	Johnson, Wash.	Moss	Smith, Minn.
Flood	Jones	Mott	Smith, N. Y.
Focht	Kahn	Murray	Smith, Tex.
Fordney	Kearns	Neely	Snell
Foss	Keating	Nicholls, S. C.	Snyder
Foster	Keister	Nichols, Mich.	Sparkman
Frear	Kelley	Nolan	Stafford
Freeman	Kennedy, Iowa	North	Steagall
Fuller	Kennedy, R. I.	Norton	Stedman
Gallagher	Key, Ohio	Oakey	Steele, Iowa
Gallivan	Kiucheloe	Oldfield	Steele, Pa.
Gandy	King	Oliver	Steernerson
Gard	Kinkaid	Olney	Stephens, Miss.
Garland	Konop	O'Shaunessy	Stephens, Nebr.
Garner	La Follette	Overmyer	Stephens, Tex.
Gillett	Langley	Padgett	Sterling
Glass	Lazaro	Paige, Mass.	Stiness
Glynn	Lee	Park	Stone
Godwin, N. C.	Leibach	Parker, N. J.	Stout
Good	Lenroot	Parker, N. Y.	Sulloway
Goodwin, Ark.	Leshner	Peters	Sumners
Gould	Lever	Phelan	Sutherland
Gray, Ala.	Lewis	Platt	Sweet
Gray, Ind.	Lieb	Porter	Swift
Green, Iowa	Liebel	Pou	Switzer
Greene, Mass.	Linthicum	Powers	Taggart
Greene, Vt.	Littlepage	Pratt	Tagne
Griest	Lloyd	Price	Talbot
Griffin	Lobeck	Quin	Taylor, Ark.
Hadley	Longworth	Ragsdale	Temple
Hamilton, Mich.	Loud	Rainey	Tilson
Hamilton, N. Y.	McAndrews	Raker	Timberlake
Hamlin	McArthur	Ramseyer	Tinkham
Hardy	McClintic	Rauch	Towner
Harrison, Miss.	McCracken	Rayburn	Treadway
Harrison, Va.	McCulloch	Reavis	Van Dyke
Haskell	McDermott	Reilly	Vare
Hastings	McFadden	Ricketts	Venable
Haugen	McGillcuddy	Riordan	Vinson
Hawley	McKellar	Roberts, Mass.	Volstead
Hayden	McKinley	Roberts, Nev.	Walker
Heaton	McLaughlin	Rogers	Walsh
Heflin	McLemore	Rouse	Wason
Helm	Magee	Rowland	Watkins
Helvering	Maher	Rucker, Ga.	Watson, Pa.
Hensley	Mann	Rucker, Mo.	Watson, Va.
Hernandez	Mapes	Russell, Mo.	Whaley
Hilliard	Martin	Russell, Ohio	Wheeler
Holland	Mays	Sanford	Williams, T. S.
Hood	Meeker	Scott, Mich.	Williams, W. E.
Hopwood	Miller, Del.	Scott, Pa.	Williams, Ohio
Houston	Miller, Pa.	Shallenberger	Wilson, Fla.
Howard	Mondell	Sherley	Wilson, Ill.
Howell	Montague	Shouse	Wilson, La.
Hughes	Moon	Siegel	Wingo
Hull, Iowa	Moore, Pa.	Sims	Wise
Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Ind.	Sinnott	Wood, Ind.
Humphrey, Wash.	Morgan, La.	Slayden	Woods, Iowa
Humphreys, Miss.	Morgan, Okla.	Sloan	Woodyard
Husted	Morin	Small	Young, N. Dak.
Hutchinson	Morrison	Smith, Idaho	Young, Tex.
Igoe		Smith, Mich.	
Jacoway			
James			

## NAYS—23.

Bailey	Gordon	London	Sisson
Burnett	Hollingsworth	Nelson	Tavener
Callaway	Huddleston	Page, N. C.	Thomas
Cramton	Johnson, Ky.	Saunders	Thompson
Davis, Tex.	Kitchin	Sears	Tillman
Doughton	Lindbergh	Sherwood	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Buchanan, Ill.	Webb
----------------	------

## NOT VOTING—55.

Anthony	Fairchild	Hicks	Oglesby
Barchfield	Ferris	Hill	Patten
Beakes	Flynn	Hinds	Randall
Beales	Gardner	Hulbert	Rosenberg
Bennet	Garrett	Johnson, S. Dak.	Sabath
Britt	Graham	Kent	Schall
Campbell	Gray, N. J.	Kless, Pa.	Scally
Carew	Gregg	Kreider	Sells
Chipfield	Guernsey	Lafean	Shackelford
Davenport	Hamill	Lott	Slomp
Dewalt	Hart	Madden	Taylor, Colo.
Edmonds	Hayes	Matthews	Ward
Edwards	Helgesen	Mooney	Winslow
Ellsworth	Henry	Mudd	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois (against) with Mr. CHIPERFIELD (for).

Until further notice:

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. HILL.

Mr. PATTEN with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. BENNET.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. WARD.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. HART with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. HENRY with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. GARDNER.

Mr. HULBERT with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. KLESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. SCHALL.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. GARRETT with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded as voting?

The SPEAKER. In the negative.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Is my colleague [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] recorded as voting?

The SPEAKER. He is not.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Then I desire to withdraw my vote and to answer present.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the hall listening?

Mr. KENT. No; I was not here. I just came in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## INQUIRY UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 429.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of January 30 days additional time was allowed to the Committee on Rules for the consideration of resolution 429, commonly known as the leak-inquiry resolution. That time will expire on the 16th. The committee are compelled to take a trip to New York to-night for probably one day, and it is apparent that there will hardly be ample time to prepare a report within the 30 days. By instruction of the Committee on Rules I therefore ask unanimous consent that 10 days' additional time be allowed the committee for the consideration of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW], by authority of the Committee on Rules, asks unanimous consent that the time limit on the so-called leak investigation be extended 10 days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## CERTAIN INDIANS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8092) confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read as follows:

## CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8092) confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

JNO. H. STEPHENS,

C. D. CARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

KEY PITTMAN,

MOSES E. CLAPP,

HARRY LANE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

## PENSIONS.

Mr. RAUCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 20748, making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and pending that motion I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if we can reach some agreement as to time for general debate.

Mr. CANNON. I have had one or two applications on this side for a little time for general debate.

Mr. MANN. I had expected to take about half an hour this afternoon, but I had rather postpone it and take it on the military bill.



Mr. KAHN. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] half an hour in the general debate on the military bill.

Mr. CANNON. There will be general debate on the military bill, will there?

Mr. MANN. Probably three hours on a side.

Mr. KAHN. I understand that we are to have three hours on a side, six hours in all, on Thursday. To-morrow being Calendar Wednesday, it will not be called up then.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. OAKLEY] wants five minutes.

Mr. RAUCH. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. CANNON. I fancy 30 minutes will be sufficient, and I do not know that there will be any time desired on this side beyond the five minutes for the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. OAKLEY].

Mr. MANN. Let me suggest to my colleague that the Printing Committee has a lot of chicken feed that we all want.

Mr. BARNHART. That has been waiting a long time.

Mr. MANN. The Printing Committee probably will not have a chance to get in with those resolutions for some time unless they come in to-day. Why not let them in this afternoon?

Mr. CANNON. I intended to ask for at least an hour on this side, but frankly I have no objection to the passage of the pension appropriation bill. I intended to discuss other matters, but I have no desire to embarrass the Committee on Printing or to take the time of the House. I fancy we are unanimously in favor of this pension appropriation bill. In fact, it would be a tolerably bold man on either side of the House who would oppose making appropriations to pay pensions under the law. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. OAKLEY] can get his five minutes under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. He does not wish to discuss the bill. He wishes his time under general debate.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose you allow this side 20 minutes—and I may not desire to consume that much time.

Mr. RAUCH. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion to go into Committee of the Whole, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on the pension bill be limited to 35 minutes, 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and 15 minutes by myself.

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, the Committee on Printing has an accumulation of some 25 or 30 little resolutions, insignificant in general but of much importance to individual Members. The committee has been trying to take up these resolutions at some time which would not interfere with any of the appropriation bills. It has seemed impossible to do so. We are now nearing the end of this Congress. Some of these resolutions must be sent to the Senate, and unless we can put them through in the very near future it will be impossible to have them considered by the Senate before the close of the present session of Congress. They will require probably 30 or 45 minutes, or if no one interferes not more than 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. They will take more time than that.

Mr. BARNHART. Well, an hour; and if we can make an arrangement to get through with the general debate and then give the Printing Committee the balance of the time, that will be agreeable to the Printing Committee.

Mr. MANN. I think nobody will contest the right of the gentleman after the pension bill is out of the way. The military bill is not to be brought in to-day.

Mr. BARNHART. The right of the Printing Committee will be contested if the pension appropriation bill occupies the balance of the evening and the Military Affairs Committee want to come in to-morrow.

Mr. RAUCH. The pension bill is short, and I know of no objection to it.

Mr. MURRAY. Let us vote "aye" on it.

Mr. CANNON. I refrain from taking time upon this bill for the reason that this session draws to a close, and I would be glad to see the necessary legislation from every standpoint enacted before the 4th of March. [Applause.] I stand to help to expedite that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. RAUCH] asks that the general debate on the pension appropriation bill be limited to 35 minutes—

Mr. RAUCH. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois has withdrawn his request for time.

Mr. CANNON. Except for five minutes for the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. OAKLEY].

Mr. RAUCH. Therefore I ask that general debate on this bill be limited to 20 minutes—

Mr. MANN. Make it 15 minutes.

Mr. RAUCH. Be limited to 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and 10 minutes by myself. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that debate on this bill be confined to 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and 10 minutes to be controlled by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. RAUCH, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20748) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, with Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20748) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman from Indiana wish me to use my time now?

Mr. RAUCH. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I yield five minutes, all the time I have, to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. OAKLEY].

Mr. OAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for the courtesy he has extended to me. My apology to you is that I simply want to make a correction in the Record which has worked out an injustice to myself and to a part of my district. I shall endeavor to be very brief, I assure you.

In the bill reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was an appropriation for a town in my district, Manchester by name. The bill carried with it an appropriation of \$40,000 for a new building in that town where the Government had owned for some years a site, a lot of land 120 by 130 feet. The committee asked me to choose what town I would like to have an appropriation made for and I selected this town, consisting of two communities, Manchester and South Manchester. I presented to them as carefully as I could the figures concerning these communities. I found that they had recommended the sum of \$40,000, which I thought was entirely too small. I wrote them, calling upon them the second or third time, and asked them to increase it because it seemed to me that the figures for this great, live community warranted more. The Supervising Architect's Office advised an appropriation of \$45,000, but the committee made it \$40,000. I let it go for \$40,000.

Much to my surprise I found in the back part of the Record the other day two criticisms that were made against this appropriation by Members of this House—one by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] and the other by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon]—putting this appropriation into the pork-barrel list.

All of this came, my friends, because I believed that the Supervising Architect's Office was not aware that the appropriation asked for was for both of these towns rather than for one, and therefore, peculiarly enough, they selected the one which is very much smaller than the other and gave to the patriotic gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Iowa figures on the small town. After the Supervising Architect had recommended an appropriation of \$45,000, which was reduced to \$40,000, they gave him the figures on the small town and thus put the community in the undesirable list of appropriations.

Mr. GLYNN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OAKLEY. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. GLYNN. The gentleman has stated that this appropriation was for two towns; I think he means for two post offices in one town.

Mr. OAKLEY. It is two communities now, and when we combine them, as far as the post office is concerned, it will be one town. The cause of this series of errors was that one of these communities was named Manchester and the combined community, when they get the new post office, if they ever do, will be also Manchester.

Now, my friends, the population of this community is approximately 18,000. The postal receipts for the last fiscal year were thirty-three thousand and some hundred dollars. The grand list is twenty-one million. They do not manufacture shoddy in Manchester, they manufacture silk. [Applause.] It is one of the greatest silk manufacturing communities in the world. They are not making subterfuge for the purpose of asking something they are not entitled to, they make American flags. [Applause.]

These communities are not only the most progressive, but the most beautiful and the most up-to-date communities in America, and are modest in asking for an appropriation with these fig-



ures. I protest, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, against this modest appropriation being put into the Record, in the back part when it was not read in the House, as a pork-barrel proposition, when it is a porterhouse steak. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RAUCH. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes from the Committee on Appropriations and carries the amount of \$160,060,000. It is in accordance with the estimates of the Commissioner of Pensions, and I ask for the reading of the bill.

The Clerk, in reading the bill for amendment, read as follows:

For fees and expenses of examining surgeons, pensions, for services rendered within the fiscal year 1918, \$60,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the fee for each examination made at the claimant's residence by an examining surgeon of the Bureau of Pensions for use in a pension claim shall be \$4 and in lieu of actual traveling expenses there shall be paid 15 cents per mile for the distance actually traveled each way, but not exceeding the distance by the most direct route between the surgeon's office and the claimant's home.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. RAUCH. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that the reason for incorporating this language in the bill is given by the Commissioner of Pensions as follows: Under the decision of the comptroller, these examining surgeons when they visit the home of a claimant are required to make a detailed report giving the items of the expenses they incur in making the trip, and it has resulted, according to the testimony of the Commissioner of Pensions, in a large and useless amount of details which he thinks can be avoided by adopting the language carried in the bill. He does not ask for an additional appropriation on account of this change in the language.

Mr. MANN. He will if it becomes necessary.

Mr. RAUCH. Yes; of course. As illustrative, they gave the committee some of the items set forth in the returns of one of the examining surgeons. He charges up for engine oil 25 cents, kerosene oil 1 cent, transmission grease for bearings 1 cent, cup grease 1 cent, and so on, with a number of very small items, to which under the law he is entitled to be paid, but which, according to the decision of the comptroller, must be set forth in detail. No doubt he drove an automobile.

There is another feature in connection with the system under the present law and that is the large expense incurred in making some of these trips when an automobile is hired, or a taxicab, for instance.

They told the committee that some trips amounted to as much as fifteen or twenty dollars under the present law.

Mr. MANN. Then they ought to discharge such an examining surgeon. If the surgeons are working them, all the commissioner has to do is to fire them. He has that authority.

Mr. RAUCH. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman speaks of a man going in an automobile that he owns. I take it there would have to be a showing made, first, as to what is the most direct route between the surgeon's office and the claimant's home; second, the distance actually traveled each way, and that will be some burden, but 15 cents a mile is a pretty large charge. We have had a controversy in this House for years as to whether or not we should be paid 20 cents a mile for bringing our families into Washington and taking them home. The surgeon's family does not have to go on these trips with him, yet it is proposed here by unanimous consent to allow 15 cents a mile each way, or 30 cents a mile one way, to a man who rides in an automobile, a train, or any other way, by himself, nobody accompanying him, for the distance between his office and the claimant's home, though, as a matter of fact, he may visit three or four claimants at the same time, without going to his office at all.

Mr. RAUCH. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say that the suggestion by the Commissioner of Pensions was a fee of \$5 and a mileage allowance of 20 cents.

Mr. MANN. He got that from our allowance, I suppose.

Mr. RAUCH. He did not so state.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; but that is what the basis of it was. There are a great many things that he does not know. He does not know that that allowance is supposed to cover the cost of a man's family coming to and going home from Washington.

Mr. RAUCH. The language is clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. MANN. There is no doubt about that, but what I am trying to do is to see if we can not cut down the 15 cents to a reasonable amount.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, you have got to have enough to compensate the surgeon, otherwise he will not perform.

Mr. MANN. There are plenty of them who will perform if he does not.

Mr. CANNON. The evidence was that they now perform in cities like Chicago and New York very largely for the sake of having a certificate to hang up in their offices. I was under the impression that this would reduce the amount that the surgeons receive after hearing all that was told about it.

Mr. MANN. It would reduce some of the amounts.

Mr. CANNON. I mean in the aggregate.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the city of Chicago is a large city, and the surgeon would have his office down town. He might live 10 miles out. He may visit half a dozen or a dozen of these people 10 miles out, and under this provision he is to get 30 cents a mile one way for each claimant for the distance between his office and the home of the claimant, though he may not travel it at all. Fifteen cents a mile each way to ride in an automobile is considerable. I dare say it does not cost anybody who owns a Packard that much money.

Mr. RAUCH. Or a Ford. If the gentleman cares to offer an amendment reducing it to 10 cents a mile, I shall not object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have had experience, and I think, taking everything into consideration, the wages of the driver, the wear and tear of the machine, I am inclined to think that from 35 to 40 cents a mile would about cover it.

Mr. MANN. That has not been my experience.

Mr. RAUCH. I will say to the gentleman that the amount of money expended for this work is not great, of course, in comparison with the other work performed by the Bureau of Pensions.

Mr. MANN. I think 10 cents a mile is enough.

Mr. RAUCH. They do say they have great difficulty in securing surgeons to perform this work.

Mr. MANN. All they need to do is to advertise that fact. I have had great difficulty at times in giving proper excuses for not getting men appointed on the board.

Mr. RAUCH. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. MANN. I do if it is going to be agreed to.

Mr. RAUCH. I stated that I would not oppose it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman support it?

Mr. RAUCH. Yes; I will support it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, and move to amend, in line 15, page 2, by striking out the word "fifteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "ten."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert the word "ten."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Indiana moves to rise, I desire to announce that I have just been informed that the Speaker of the House is a granddaddy. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed a moment, as a grandfather for 21 years I take great pleasure in welcoming the Speaker of the House to the company of grandfathers—I sometimes say old fool grandfathers. [Laughter.] And I know he is qualified, for he is the recipient of a hat of the vintage of 1852, donated by the gentleman from California [Mr. Kent.] [Laughter.]

Mr. RAUCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker resumed the chair amid applause.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House, one touch of nature makes the whole world kin. [Applause.] The happiest moments in my life have been the day I was married, the days my children were born, the day that this, the first of my grandchildren, was born [applause], and I hope there will be many more of them. [Laughter and applause.] The more Americans there are the better the country and the world are off. The other happiest day of my life was when I was a student at the Kentucky University, when at the end of the first examination in Greek four of us made the grade of 100 on a scale of 100. [Applause.] That was the first victory I ever won among strangers, and it was a very happy occasion; and from the



very bottom of my heart I thank this House for this last evidence of its love and affection for me and mine. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20748) and directs me to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RAUCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FULLER. There is a little pension bill concerning proof of widowhood in pension cases that will take about two minutes, and I ask unanimous consent now that it may be considered now in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 20353). Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. What is the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Let the bill be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report by the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20353) concerning proof of widowhood in claims for pension.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill will be called up in its regular order on Monday.

Mr. FULLER. No; there will be no chance to reach it unless it can be passed now. It will not take two minutes. It has a unanimous report from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and there can be no objection to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I went over the bill on last unanimous-consent day, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. FULLER. It will take but a minute.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Wisconsin has objected.

#### RESOLUTIONS FROM COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution, and, preliminary to the consideration of it, I want to make a very brief statement. The allotment by the Appropriations Committee for the printing of the Congress for the last fiscal year was \$1,340,000. Of that three-fourths has been expended; and if the Senate will be as economical up to the close of the session as the House has been we will have more than a quarter of a million dollars of this to turn back into the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I will yield.

Mr. MANN. They have just sent a deficiency estimate for congressional printing, I think, of about half a million dollars.

Mr. BARNHART. If that is correct, it has come from the Senate side and within the past 24 hours.

Mr. MANN. It came from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BARNHART. That may be for departmental printing, not for congressional printing.

Mr. MANN. It says congressional printing.

Mr. BARNHART. The report we have from the Government printers shows a balance of \$313,862 quite recently.

Mr. MANN. Unless I am very much mistaken—and I might be—the deficiency estimate just received from the Secretary of the Treasury carried several hundred thousand dollars deficiency for congressional printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Well, if that is the situation, it has developed within a very few days; and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House has not expended any such amount in the past six months.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I will yield.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Has not the Senate recently enacted some legislation in the way of economy of expenditures by setting some limit on the material that is to go into the Record?

Mr. BARNHART. The Senate passed an abbreviated printing bill, the one that the House has considered twice and passed once and the Senate has passed once, and that was passed at a night session, placing a limitation upon publication in the Con-

GRESSIONAL RECORD and providing for the distribution of documents in a somewhat modified way from the plan which we proposed in the bill we have heretofore enacted, giving to each Member of Congress the documents that he needs rather than apportion to him an allotment of all documents printed, many of which he can not possibly use.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Are we going to have an opportunity to vote on such wise legislation?

Mr. BARNHART. We will have an opportunity to vote upon such wise legislation if somebody does not interpose an objection to unanimous consent, or the Rules Committee will give the Committee on Printing a rule to bring in such a bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The Record of to-day has about 150 pages in it.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say in that connection that a matter came up day before yesterday in which a Member of the House asked unanimous consent to insert some reprint in the Record, and when I inquired about it I was told it did not amount to very much. But I went and looked up the figures and discovered that that one item, that is, the item of inserting in the Record along the one particular line by this one particular Member, amounted to 119 pages, which will cost the Government for the printing alone \$3,850, and the franking privilege will be in addition to that. It is a limitation bill on such extraneous matter that the Committee on Printing hopes to be able to get up for consideration and passed within an hour, if we can get the consent of the House to call it up.

OPINION NO. 4229 (H. REPT. NO. 1468).

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 464.

*Resolved*, That there shall be printed, for the use of the House of Representatives, 10,000 copies of Opinion No. 4229 of the Interstate Commerce Commission, designated as Document No. 9284, relating to the car-supply investigation, to be distributed to Members of the House through the folding room.

Also, the following committee amendments were read:

Line 2, strike out "10" and insert "5," so that it will read "5,000 copies of Opinion No. 4229."

Line 7, strike out "folding" and insert "document," so that it will read "through the document room."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the deficiency estimates from the Secretary of the Treasury dated February 5, 1917, and referred in this House to the Committee on Appropriations on February 6, 1917. The first item in it is "Legislative. Public Printer. Public printing and binding: For public printing, public binding, and for paper for public printing and binding, including the cost of printing the debates and proceedings of Congress in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," and so forth—the same item that is carried by the appropriation bill for congressional printing—\$520,937.05.

Mr. BARNHART. I hold in my hand a report dated January 28, in which the Public Printer reports a balance in the Treasury to the credit of congressional printing to the amount of \$316,000. Somebody is evidently mistaken. I get my information from the Public Printer.

Mr. MANN. Over \$300,000 out of millions of dollars is not very much left to the last of January, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not possible that this deficiency appropriation is desired to be used after the adjournment of Congress?

Mr. BARNHART. Possibly so, but I call attention to the fact that the total of these bills that we are now considering will be less than \$25,000, and if the balance of the money is expended it will be done by the Senate hereafter, because the House has very little more to do. The department is trying to raise their contracts for public printing, but so far the Joint Committee on Printing has been intervening and preventing it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the document that is purposed to be authorized under this resolution?

Mr. BARNHART. This is the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on car shortage. It is a little document that costs \$118, a resolution submitted by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP], and is said to be very important to the coal-producing regions of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.



## RAILROAD STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS (H. REPT. NO. 1467).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I send up another privileged resolution to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.  
The Clerk read as follows:

## House resolution 438.

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Railway Strikes and Lockouts," compiled by the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation, containing a compilation of the laws of all countries relating to strikes and the settlement of industrial disputes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## OCEAN SHIPPING (H. REPT. NO. 1466).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I send another resolution to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is it privileged?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.  
The Clerk read as follows:

## House resolution 294.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and instructed to have printed 5,000 copies of second edition, May, 1916, Ocean Shipping: The Basic Principles of Marine Transportation with Particular Reference to the Foreign Trade of the United States, published by the National Foreign Council, 64 Stone Street, New York, as a public document.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

In line 1, strike out the words "The Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and instructed to have" and insert the words "there be," and after the word "printed," in line 2, strike out "five thousand" and insert "two thousand five hundred," and in line 8, after the word "document," insert the words "for the use of the House of Representatives," so that the resolution as amended will read: "*Resolved*, That there be printed 2,500 copies of second edition, May, 1916, Ocean Shipping: The Basic Principles of Marine Transportation with Particular Reference to the Foreign Trade of the United States, published by the National Foreign Trade Council, 64 Stone Street, New York, as a public document, for the use of the House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. How will that document be distributed?

Mr. BARNHART. It will be distributed through the folding room.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, before presenting another privileged resolution I want to call the attention of the membership of the House to a message just received from the Public Printer, in which he says that the unencumbered balance for printing and binding to-day is \$208,000.

Mr. MANN. But this is only the first of February.

## CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND &amp; PACIFIC RAILWAY CO. (H. REPT. NO. 1465).

Mr. BARNHART. Now, I submit another privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House resolution 227.

*Resolved*, That there be printed 5,000 copies of the record of the investigation made by the Interstate Commerce Commission with reference to the financial transactions, history, and operation of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Insert, after the word "company," in the last line, the words "for use in the House document room."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. What expense would be occasioned by the printing of this document—the reprinting of the testimony concerning the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.?

Mr. BARNHART. It would cost \$21.54. It costs \$12 a minute to run the House. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

## WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in H. R. 2547, first session Fifty-fourth Congress.

## STATUE OF GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO (H. REPT. NO. 1464).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.  
The Clerk read as follows:

## House concurrent resolution 58.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there shall be printed and bound in the form of eulogies, with accompanying illustrations, 17,100 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko in Washington, May 11, 1910, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 to be delivered to the National Polish-American Alliance for such distribution as said alliance may desire to make, and the remaining 100 copies shall be bound in full morocco and distributed through the Department of State to the descendants of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko and the speakers who took part in said celebration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

## STATUE OF COUNT CASIMIR PULASKI (H. REPT. NO. 1463).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House concurrent resolution 59.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there shall be printed and bound in the form of eulogies, with accompanying illustrations, 17,100 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of Count Casimir Pulaski in Washington, May 11, 1910, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 to be delivered to the National Polish-American Alliance for such distribution as said alliance may desire to make, and the remaining 100 copies shall be bound in full morocco and distributed through the Department of State to the descendants of Count Casimir Pulaski and the speakers who took part in said celebration.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that is presented as a privileged resolution. It is not, but I shall not make a point of order on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

## NAVIGATION LAWS (H. REPT. NO. 1480).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I send another privileged resolution to the Clerk's desk and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House resolution 150.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and instructed to have printed 10,000 copies of "Navigation laws, comparative study of principal features of the laws of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Norway, France, and Japan," contained in report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to the Secretary of Commerce on January 12, 1916 (Special Agents' Series No. 114).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee there is that the resolution do not pass.

Mr. MANN. Move to lay it on the table.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana moves to lay the resolution on the table. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## SOIL SURVEY OF THE BILOXI AREA, MISSISSIPPI (H. REPT. NO. 1469).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House resolution 14.

*Resolved*, That there shall be printed 1,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of the Biloxi Area, Mississippi, for use in the House document room.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MANN. For whose benefit is it? Who represents the district?

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Illinois asks a very important question. There are about 15—

Mr. MANN. Why does not the gentleman answer it?

Mr. BARNHART. I am trying to answer it, if the gentleman will give me time. I can not answer as readily as the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. These proceedings cost \$12 a minute. All I want to know is the name of the Member.

Mr. BARNHART. The name of the Member is Mr. BORLAND. He introduced the resolution.



Mr. MANN. Who will get these copies? This is a soil survey of a particular place, and I am not opposed to it, but just for curiosity I want to know the name of the Member who gets the copies.

Mr. BARNHART. We could have that read for each resolution. The documents go to the document room. The author of the resolution is Mr. BORLAND, of Missouri.

Mr. MANN. But this is for a soil survey in Mississippi.

Mr. LEVER. Is there any special reason for printing these extra copies? As I understand, the Department of Agriculture prints 2,000 copies for the House of Representatives and 2,000 copies for the Senate, which would make 4,000 copies of any one particular survey. Is there any particular reason for this reprint?

Mr. BARNHART. The supplies are exhausted. I want to say a word in behalf of the Committee on Printing. For more than two years none of these soil-survey resolutions have been reported out of the Committee on Printing; but the pressure has been very strong from the Members who introduced these resolutions, and we decided to submit them all to the House for its consideration. The committee itself believe that this matter is or ought to be wholly in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, and that that department ought to provide an ample allowance. It is given an appropriation each year to take care of all these matters. Yet we are constantly besieged by Members who have requests for these soil surveys. Speaking for myself, we have had some soil surveys in the district which I represent, and I had notices placed in many of the newspapers stating that these soil surveys were available, but I think I have had less than 50 requests for them.

Mr. FOSTER. The farmers in the gentleman's district are very intelligent.

Mr. MANN. I have always been rather of the opinion that when the Government goes to very great expense in making a soil survey, which is primarily useful only to the men who occupy the soil, if they want to obtain copies of the survey they ought to have them.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But my curiosity is not yet satisfied. For the life of me, I can not see why the gentleman from Kansas City [Mr. BORLAND] should be interested in placing in the document room a thousand copies of a soil survey of Biloxi, Miss., and I think we are entitled to an explanation as to who is going to get the copies.

Mr. BARNHART. This is for Jackson County, Mo.

Mr. MANN. No; the Clerk read Biloxi, Miss. I think the gentleman is talking about the wrong resolution.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. This resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. MANN. That is different. I could not understand before. I have no objection to the resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire how many such resolutions the chairman of the committee has to report.

Mr. BARNHART. About 15.

Mr. STAFFORD. All relating to soil surveys?

Mr. BARNHART. All relating to soil surveys.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the cost of the reprint?

Mr. BARNHART. Each one of these costs less than \$500. This one which I hold in my hand will cost \$412. We cut the number down so that they would cost less than \$500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any resolutions other than those providing for soil surveys?

Mr. BARNHART. No others.

Mr. CANNON. The original survey was printed at the Agricultural Department?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. That is exhausted?

Mr. BARNHART. The supply is exhausted. The plates of the maps, and so forth, are all preserved, and the cost of the reprinting is only nominal, in some cases only \$150 for 2,000 copies.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why can not they now be printed in the Agricultural Department?

Mr. BARNHART. They ought to be printed by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman made any inquiry of the Agricultural Department as to why they do not reprint?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; and they say they do not consider that the original appropriation or allotment for printing gives them authority to reprint.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many bills has the committee had under consideration providing for reprints?

Mr. BARNHART. Twelve or fifteen.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are any others pending?

Mr. BARNHART. No; no others pending. This covers the whole field.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is establishing a precedent that may come back to plague us in the future. If every Member who has a soil survey in his district comes here and wants a reprint it will be a burden on us.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that reprints have not heretofore been authorized by the House, because I am advised that there have been frequently reprints ordered, but not within the time that I have been chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think these matters ought to go over for further consideration. I hope the gentleman will not submit any more.

Mr. BARNHART. I think that they ought to be submitted and disposed of. The committee has had them for a long time, and as far as the committee is concerned it would like to be absolved from any further obligation in the matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman assure us that there will be no more at this session?

Mr. BARNHART. There are no more before the committee.

Mr. CARY. I would suggest to the gentleman that he offer them all in bulk, let them be read by title, and passed at once.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will ask unanimous consent I am willing to have it done.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the committee offer all these bills for reprint of soil surveys in bulk and the titles be read and we vote on them as one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may offer all of the resolutions in bulk and be voted upon as one.

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY, BRYAN COUNTY, OKLA. (H. REPT. NO. 1470).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another resolution and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 102.

Resolved, That 2,000 additional copies of the soil survey of Bryan County, Okla., as made by the Bureau of Soils of the Department of Agriculture, be printed for use in the House document room.

Mr. MANN. How many copies are provided for in this resolution?

Mr. BARNHART. Two thousand.

Mr. MANN. I thought in the Harrison resolution it was fixed at 1,000 copies.

Mr. BARNHART. Probably that is all the resolution asked for.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me that that is all we ought to give them.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many copies are provided for in the resolution just passed?

The CHAIRMAN. The resolution that was just passed provided for 1,000.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would remind the gentleman that some counties are much more populous than others. The counties in my district have 3,000 or more population, and certainly there ought to be a greater number in such counties than in counties with a less population.

Mr. MANN. The county in which my district is located has a population of 3,000,000, and yet I think a thousand copies of the soil survey will more than go around.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It so happens that the people I speak of have a great interest in these surveys.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Printing has investigated these matters.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; the committee has not investigated them.

Mr. ALMON. I want to say that I went before the committee and explained to them the great demand there was in my district, and they cut it down a half.

Mr. MANN. How much does the gentleman get in his resolution?

Mr. ALMON. I have had the promise of 2,000, and that will not supply the demand in Madison County.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think there ought to be one rule followed. We are granting favors to Members here.

Mr. MANN. After all, it is for the benefit of the people.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are picking out 12 and giving a persimmon to them in the nature of a reprint. Why should not the persimmons be for all?



Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will not object.

The supply has been exhausted in most of them. Madison County is the largest county, and the county that has taken the lead in agriculture in Alabama, the first to organize a livestock association and the first to eradicate the cattle tick, and the people there are clamoring for these reports. I asked for 5,000, and the committee has cut it down to 2,000, costing less than \$500. I trust that no one will object to it.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], after hearing the pathetic appeal of the gentleman from Alabama, can understand how it is impossible for the Committee on Printing to resist.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can now understand the worries the gentleman has had in times past and how well he has borne up under them with his benign smile.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY OF PERRY COUNTY, ALA. (H. REPT. NO. 1472).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 177.

*Resolved*, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of Perry County, Ala., for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

With the following committee amendment:

Lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "for the use of the Department of Agriculture" and insert "for the use of the House document room."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY OF MADISON COUNTY, ALA. (H. REPT. NO. 1473).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 231.

*Resolved*, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of Madison County, Ala., for the use of the House document room.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 1 strike out the word "five" and insert the word "two."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY OF JEFFERSON COUNTY, ALA. (H. REPT. NO. 1471).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 74.

*Resolved*, That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of the Soil Survey of Jefferson County, Ala., for the use of the House document room.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the words "five hundred."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY OF NEW ORLEANS AREA, LOUISIANA (H. REPT. NO. 1474).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 263.

*Resolved*, That there shall be printed 1,000 copies of the Soil Survey of the New Orleans Area, Louisiana, for the use of the House document room.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Who gets this?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. DUPRE.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection, but I just like to know out of curiosity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY OF CHESTERFIELD COUNTY, S. C. (H. REPT. NO. 1475).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 267.

*Resolved*, That there be printed 1,250 additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Soil Survey of Chesterfield County, S. C.," for the use of the House document room.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have had it in mind to introduce a resolution to provide for the printing of 10,000 copies of the Declaration of Independence in order that some of the people of the United States might reread that document, and also for the printing of 10,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States. Is the gentleman in position to say whether those two propositions would have consideration before his committee?

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, yes. All resolutions of that character introduced have consideration before the Committee on Printing, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if he will introduce his resolutions and come before the committee, will surely have a favorable hearing and most likely a favorable report.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I shall introduce the resolution and ask for the reprinting of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It may do some good.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks upon the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY OF DECATUR COUNTY, GA. (H. REPT. NO. 1476).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 379.

*Resolved*, That there be printed 1,250 additional copies of the Soil Survey of Decatur County, Ga., for the use of the House document room.

Mr. MANN. Who gets this?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. PARK, of Georgia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the House whether there is any resolution covering the Northern States which might possibly have impoverished soils, or is it confined to the Southern States?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee did not consider the question in a sectional way at all; it considered the separate bills as they came to the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. It just happened that the most of them are in the South?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee took the bills as they were introduced and as they happened to come before it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The presumption is that these soil surveys come from localities where there is a movement in real estate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it would presume to be stagnant in the North.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think so.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY OF TIFT COUNTY, GA. (H. REPT. NO. 1477).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer another privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 380.

*Resolved*, That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of Tift County, Ga., for the use of the House document room.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

RECONNOISSANCE SOIL SURVEY OF NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA (H. REPT. NO. 1478).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution and ask for its passage.



The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 460.

*Resolved*, That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of the Reconnaissance Soil Survey of Northeastern Pennsylvania for use of the House document room.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

After the word "printed" strike out "2,000" and insert "1,500."

Mr. MANN. Who gets this?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

The question was taken and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The question was taken and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

BIOGRAPHICAL CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY (H. REPT. NO. 1479).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit a final privileged resolution and ask the attention of the House while it is being read.

The Clerk read, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 23.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed and bound 10,000 copies of the Biographical Congressional Directory, revised and corrected to the Sixty-fourth Congress, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 7,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 3,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Does that involve two volumes?

Mr. BARNHART. Two.

Mr. MANN. One being the old volume?

Mr. BARNHART. No; it only brings it up to date. It is revised and corrected.

Mr. MANN. That is what I thought; it is to take the old volume—

Mr. BARNHART. And add another to it.

Mr. MANN. And add another volume to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain what it will cost for the printing of this?

Mr. BARNHART. Six thousand four hundred and twenty-seven dollars.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will an additional expense be occasioned by the payment to any clerk attached to the joint committee?

Mr. BARNHART. There was not in the last revision. There was an effort made to secure an allowance, but Congress never did allow it.

Mr. STAFFORD. And a good chance Congress will not allow it now.

Mr. BARNHART. Would not allow it by consent of the present chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Who is supposed to do this work of revision?

Mr. BARNHART. That is supposed to be done by the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing, I take it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It seems to me he has got his hands pretty full now to take on such an important work as that.

Mr. STAFFORD. The work has been going right along.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It has been done heretofore by extra time, and the clerk ought to be paid for it.

Mr. BARNHART. It was done by extra time, and the last time there was no allowance.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. And he should be entitled to his pay. He worked at night.

Mr. STAFFORD. This work has been done in the recent past in connection with his regular work as clerk of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; it was done by a clerk in the Secretary's office.

Mr. MANN. The Congressional Directory for years has carried information about the duties of the various departments of the Government. Why is that left out of the last one?

Mr. BARNHART. For the reason that from time to time the names that were submitted by the departments had accumulated into such a volume that the directory was too cumbersome; and, moreover, the enormous expense of print paper at present is such that it is the purpose of the Joint Committee on Printing that the number of the pages in the book be curtailed to the immediate needs at this time.

Mr. MANN. That does not answer the question. The gentleman talks about names. What names does the gentleman have reference to?

Mr. BARNHART. The names of the subordinate officers of the various departments.

Mr. MANN. Those are in the directory. Evidently the gentleman has not given consideration to it. What they have left out is the part that describes the duties of the different departments. I do not know how other gentlemen are, but that is a matter of constant reference in my office. We do not keep old directories lying around. New directories are on the table.

Every day, nearly, some letter comes along, and you want to know what department to visit in order to find out about it. My secretary constantly refers to the Congressional Directory for that information, which is valuable. You have left it out, although it is the most valuable information in the directory outside of the names of Members of Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield? I have in my hand a recent issue of the Congressional Directory, which gives the work of the various departments, and I wonder whether he refers to something else besides the duties of the various departments and duties of the Government.

Mr. MANN. The trouble with the gentleman is that he is slow.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not so very. Of course, slow in comparison with the gentleman as the leader.

Mr. MANN. Yes. You have the December directory. The last edition was issued in February.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is the one I received at the Clerk's desk. I do not have the latest here. Of course, no one can keep pace with the pacemaker of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1878 and move that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina asks to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1878 and insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1878) making appropriations for payment of certain claims in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims in accordance with the act approved March 3, 1883, commonly known as the Bowman and Tucker Act, and under the provision of section 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the naval bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the present occupant of the chair be allowed to name the conferees on the conference asked for and agreed to by the House just now on Senate bill 1878.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the present occupant of the chair may announce the conferees upon the Senate bill 1878, on the part of the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair announces the following conferees: Mr. GREGG, Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, and Mr. FOCHT.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, for fear that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] misunderstood me, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise and include certain remarks in my speech of this afternoon on the naval bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks in the Record on the naval bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, since on to-morrow we are going to have the presidential count, and that will take place at 1 o'clock p. m., it will be impossible for the House to do much business until that time, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 12.30 p. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 12.30 o'clock



p. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] yield to me for a question? Will the Army appropriation bill be taken up immediately?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; but on Thursday morning. We will have Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow.

#### Hour of Meeting on Thursday.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Wednesday, it adjourn to meet the next day, Thursday, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Wednesday, it adjourn to meet on Thursday at 11 o'clock a. m. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### Enrolled Bills Signed.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10697. An act for the relief of S. Spencer Carr;

H. R. 8092. An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington; and

H. R. 17055. An act providing when patents shall issue to the purchaser or heirs on certain lands in the State of Oregon.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 7486. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

#### Enrolled Bills Presented to the President for His Approval.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 8492. An act to restore homestead rights in certain cases;

H. R. 8669. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the lease of certain land in Stanley County, S. Dak., for a buffalo pasture; and

H. R. 17055. An act providing when patents shall issue to the purchaser or heirs on certain lands in the State of Oregon.

#### Message from the Senate.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, and Mr. WARREN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 13 and 98 to the bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, had insisted upon the amendments of the Senate to said bill and agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. GALLINGER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 14074. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village of Fox Lake, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across both arms of the Fox River where it connects Pistakee Lake and Nippersink Lake, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;

H. R. 17602. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Polk County, Minn., and Grand Forks County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across Red River of the North, on the boundary line between said States;

H. R. 17710. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Tullapoosa River, separating the counties of Montgomery and Elmore, in the State of Alabama, at a point somewhere between Judkin Ferry and Hughes Ferry; and

H. R. 18529. An act granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Rapides Parish, La., to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Boyce, La.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

#### House concurrent resolution 65.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the Journal of the fifty-first national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1917, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

#### House concurrent resolution 70.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That there be printed 5,000 copies, bound in buckram, for the use of the House of Representatives, of the manuscript prepared by Hon. MERRILL MOORES, being a digest of contested-election cases in the House of Representatives from 1901 to 1917, together with laws relating to contested elections in the House of Representatives and campaign contributions and expenditures.

#### With the following amendment:

Line 3, strike out "for the use of the House of Representatives."

Line 7, after "expenditures," insert "of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies for the use of the House."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, had requested a further conference with the House on the said bill and amendment thereto, and had appointed Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. NELSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### Extension of Remarks.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in regard to the foreign situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in regard to the foreign situation. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### Appointment of Speaker Pro Tempore on Sunday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints Mr. JACOWAY to preside next Sunday at the memorial services on the late Senator CLARKE of Arkansas.

#### Adjournment.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the special order, until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 14, 1917, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

#### Reports of Committees on Private Bills and Resolutions.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15656) for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1455), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16482) to reimburse Capt. E. D. Kremers, Medical Corps, United States Army, for rent of quarters at Honolulu, Hawaii, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1456), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15572) for the relief of W. T. Dingler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1457), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FOSTER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2742) to reimburse Isaiah Stephens, postmaster of McMechen, Marshall County, W. Va., for money and postage stamps stolen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1458), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.



Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5990) to reimburse S. S. Buzzard, postmaster of Berkeley Springs, Morgan County, W. Va., for cash stolen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1459), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1659) for the relief of Carrie A. Notley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1460), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1623) for the relief of George F. Weaver, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1461), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FOSTER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9171) for the relief of Arthur J. Burdick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1462), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 20892) to establish aids to navigation at Fond du Lac Harbor, Wis.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 20893) authorizing the county of Morrison, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 20894) to include certain lands in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou, Cal., in the Modoc National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 20895) to repeal the provision for compulsory military service in the national defense act approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 20896) to provide for the issuance of search warrants and the seizure and detention of property thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 502) directing the Secretary of War to transmit information relative to aeroplane service in Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Resolution (H. Res. 503) authorizing the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Handbook on care and operation of gasoline engines"; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 20897) granting an increase of pension to William Horrigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 20898) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Orren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 20899) granting an increase of pension to David W. Bachelder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 20900) for the relief of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 20901) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 20902) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Rapelye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 20903) for the relief of Mrs. Annie M. Lepley, as postmaster at Plymouth, Amador County, Cal., for money, postal-money orders, and postage stamps stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 20904) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Bentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Owatonna, Minn., protesting against a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Wine and Spirit Importers' Society of the United States, protesting against the passage of the Bankhead bill or the rider to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of committee on the suppression of the pine blister in North America, relative to appropriation for the suppression of the pine-blister rust, and urging the support of the amendment to the Federal quarantine act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Miss Mary W. Parsons, Asheville, N. C., favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry members of National Legislative and Information Bureau, opposing House bill 20752 and Senate bill 8201; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of editors and editorial staff of the Philadelphia Record, in favor of the volunteer officers' retired-list bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Cranford M. Bishop, of Summit, N. J., approving universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of committee on the suppression of the pine blister in North America, relative to appropriation for the suppression of the pine-blister rust; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the New Jersey Division of the National Woman's Peace Party, against compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Employees' Union, relative to including the 5 and 10 per cent increase in salaries in the sundry civil bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of First Congregational Church of Oswego, Ill., for a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Carl Poltrock, of Ottawa, Ill., for Callaway referendum resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of several citizens of Illinois, favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Wissen, president Juergen Muentz Society, against war with any foreign power unless war is first declared against the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of a meeting of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Branch of the German-American Alliance, held at Boston February 9, 1917, opposing a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of a meeting of the Board of Government of the Hooker Association of Massachusetts, favoring universal and compulsory military training of all male citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial adopted at a mass meeting held at Krueger Auditorium, Newark, N. J., February 10, 1917, opposing a declaration of war unless the question of war be submitted to a referendum of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT: Petition of 100 Christian church people of Kenton; 100 people of North Christian Union, of Kenton; 25 people of Troy; church people of Rives; 40 people of Medon; 50 people of Kenton; 50 people of Medon; and churches of Rives, all in the State of Tennessee, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON: Memorial of the council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, urging the adoption of House joint resolution 355; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial adopted by Local Union No. 1500, United Mine Workers of America, Mahanoy City, Pa., requesting an investigation of the high cost of living, with the end in view to reduce same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of William P. Davis and 14 other post-office officials and mail carriers at Salem, Ohio, asking increase of wages; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorials of National Wool Growers' Association, in favor of an experimental sheep farm under the



Department of Agriculture in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of undergraduates of Princeton University in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of 50 Flemington Woman's Christian Temperance Union people, Flemington, N. J., and 50 people at a public meeting at Bernardsville, N. J., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY: Petition for an increase of pay of rural carriers from Edward J. Marshick and others; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of employees of Post Office Department, relative to House bill 17806; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial adopted by the Equal Rights Association of Kentucky at its annual convention of 1916 to protect women against State denial of the rights of citizens of the United States to vote for Members of Congress, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, opposing a declaration of war unless the question of war be submitted to a referendum of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Letter from William P. Beeber, Williamsport, Pa., favoring the selection of Cairo, Ill., as a site for the location of the new Government armor plant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Mr. B. L. Becker, secretary of the Pittsburgh Rationalist Society, Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against anything that will embroil the Nation in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Jessie Leigh Hutchinson, corresponding secretary of the Kentucky Equal Rights' Association, of Lexington, Ky., with reference to the enactment of laws that "shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of Sandusky Local, Socialist Party of Ohio, protesting against involving this country in the European war and favoring complete embargo against the warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of members of Congregational Church of Willsboro, N. Y., Rev. C. W. Grupe, Mrs. C. W. Grupe, W. H. Mussen, E. A. Lewis, E. W. Hoskins, F. F. Hayward, Mrs. Mussen, Mrs. Sadie F. Hoffnagle, Mrs. Jacob Reaffel, Miss E. E. Reed, E. B. Shedd, A. B. Chatterton, Mrs. Carrie Higby, Mrs. Jennie J. Hoskins, Mrs. Thomas Rathbun, Mrs. Leon Weston, Oscar F. Styles, Mrs. William Nichols, J. M. Shedd, Elizabeth Morhous, L. H. Baldwin, C. H. Stafford, and W. B. Seymour, favoring submission to the States of a national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of the Rome (N. Y.) Typographical Union, against legislation prohibiting the advertising in newspapers of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Rome (N. Y.) Typographical Union, for increased compensation of printers in United States post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petitions of residents of the fifth Wisconsin district, protesting against national and District of Columbia prohibition and the mail-exclusion acts; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Grand Junction, Colo., protesting against the proposed zone rate of postage for periodicals and magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of State legislative committee of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of Colorado, protesting against the passage of the Shields water-power bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of 50 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hotchkiss; 53 members of Sunday school and 36 members of Bible assembly of Montrose, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petitions of Methodist Church, Lafayette; Friends' Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, Boulder; Ladies' Aid of Baptist Church, Boulder; Woman's Home Mission Society, Boulder; the Nazarene Congregation, Boulder; Erie Methodist Episcopal Congregation, Erie; Boulder Assembly, No. 69, National Americans, Boulder; Methodist Sunday School, Lafayette; Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Boulder, all in the State of Colorado, favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 14, 1917.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we are called upon once more to face the solemn responsibilities of this hour and this place, we call upon Thy name and open our hearts to the impression of Thy truth and spirit. Every thought of God elevates and chastens our minds, and every thought of our hearts we desire to bring into subjection to Thy will that we may understand the far-reaching influence of all the acts of our lives, especially when we act as representatives of the States of this great country. Guide us this day in the discharge of the duties that are before us, and at its close may we have the comfortable assurance that we have done that which is pleasing in Thy sight. For Christ's sake. Amen.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there are not more than a dozen Senators present, and to save time I raise the point of no quorum.

Mr. PENROSE. I think the Senator is incorrect. There are nine Senators present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hollis	Page	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Jones	Penrose	Smith, Md.
Brandagee	Kenyon	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	La Follette	Ransdell	Smoot
Clapp	Lodge	Robinson	Stone
Curtis	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Sutherland
Fernald	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Thomas
Fletcher	Norris	Shields	Weeks
Gallinger	Overman	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. OLIVER, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. WADSWORTH, and Mr. WALSH answered to their names when called.

Mr. BANKHEAD entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. BRYAN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to state that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. KIRBY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. LANE, Mr. WORKS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. LEA of Tennessee, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HUSTING, and Mr. CUMMINS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. BRYAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 8092) confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which I ask may be read.

The resolutions were read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

February 9, 1917.

Ordered, That it is the sense of the house of representatives that the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, regardless of race, creed, color, or party, in the present national crisis, stand now, as always, as one man ready to support with their blood and treasure the